CHINESE-THAI DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION IN BANGKOK: An Exploratory Study

by
Boonsanong Punyodyana

Cornell Thailand Project
Interim Reports Series
Number Thirteen

DATA PAPER: NUMBER 79
SOUTHEAST ASIA PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF ASIAN STUDIES
CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK
MARCH 1971

PRICE: $4.00

CHINESE-THAI DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION IN BANGKOK: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

THE CORNELL UNIVERSITY SOUTHEAST ASIA PROGRAM

The Southeast Asia Program was organized at Cornell University in the Department of Far Eastern Studies in 1951. It is a teaching and research program of interdisciplinary studies in the humanities, social sciences, and some natural sciences. It deals with Southeast Asia as a region, and with the individual countries of the area: Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

The activities of the Program are carried on both at Cornell and in Southeast Asia. They include an undergraduate and graduate curriculum at Cornell which provides instruction by specialists in Southeast Asian cultural history and present-day affairs and offers intensive training in each of the major languages of the area. The Program sponsors group research projects on Thailand, on Indonesia, on the Philippines, and on the area's Chinese minorities. At the same time, individual staff and students of the Program have done field research in every Southeast Asian country.

A list of publications relating to Southeast Asia which may be obtained on prepaid order directly from the Program is given at the end of this volume. Information on Program staff, fellowships, requirements for degrees, and current course offerings will be found in an *Announcement of the Department of Asian Studies*, obtainable from the Director, Southeast Asia Program, Franklin Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.

CHINESE-THAI DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION IN BANGKOK: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

by

Boonsanong Punyodyana

Cornell Thailand Project
Interim Reports Series
Number Thirteen

Data Paper: Number 79
Southeast Asia Program
Department of Asian Studies
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
March 1971

Price: $4.00

FOREWORD

The first Data Paper in this Cornell Southeast Asia Program series, issued in February, 1951, was a report on the Chinese in Southeast Asia by G. William Skinner. When Skinner emerged on the southern coast of China after a long journey from Szechuan in the late summer of 1950, the Program asked him to visit the major centers of Chinese settlement in Southeast Asia, not only to report on the comparative post-war situations of the "South Seas" or Nanyang Chinese in the various societies of the region, but also to determine the feasibility and potential usefulness of field research in these living Chinese communities for social scientists trained for the study of China proper.

In an introduction to Skinner's report on his hurried but remarkably thorough and systematic survey, the Program director suggested that the findings indicated clearly that future studies of both the developmental economics and the ideological and political developments in the region would have to take the Nanyang Chinese into account. There were obvious functional relationships among these areas of study, so that an understanding of one field would be enhanced by an understanding of the others. Studies concerned with the nations of the region or with their dominant peoples could not afford to neglect the immigrant minorities who had moved out from the Chinese center to the neighboring countries to the south. The hope was expressed that the overseas Chinese of Southeast Asia and their role in the cultural development of the nations of the region might become major subjects of investigation under the programs of training and research on Asia then established at Cornell.

The Cornell Southeast Asia Program did succeed in supporting a number of studies in this field. Professor Skinner went on to produce his ably conceived and executed and still definitive studies of the Chinese in Thailand, work which included important innovations in methods of analysis. He also carried out a comparative field research project on categories of Chinese in Java. Donald Willmott, Mary Somers and Giok-Lan Tan have published an important series of papers and monographs on the Chinese in Indonesia. George Weightman's doctoral dissertation was on a Chinese community in the Philippines. Giok Po Oey has contributed a valuable bibliography which includes Chinese historical sources on the Nanyang Chinese. Finally, the Program has published a translation of N. A. Simoniya's Russian study of the overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia.

To these few contributions to our knowledge of the ten million or more Chinese resident in Southeast Asia must be added,

of course, the work of many other scholars--Amyot, Coughlin, Freeman, Purcell, Smith, Williams, W. Willmott, to name only some of the westerners--who have made special studies in the area during the past two decades. But as Professor Skinner notes in discussing the joint London-Cornell Project for Social Research in China and Southeast Asia, "While this field of study has not been wholly neglected, its intellectual rewards are only now becoming fully apparent. To begin with, the great and well-documented Chinese migration which reached its climax throughout Southeast Asia in the third decade of this century, enables scholars to study *on a comparative basis* the subsequent fate of Chinese immigrants and their descendants. In this regard, Southeast Asia provides a veritable laboratory for research in assimilation and acculturation, for one can isolate for study the descendants of immigrants, members of the *same* dialect group who migrated from the *same* port for the *same* reasons in the *same* years to a number of *different* receiving societies. At the same time, the study of Chinese communities overseas promises to facilitate the analysis of institutions in the homeland. The study of Chinese associations in Singapore has provided important clues to the social structure of cities in China proper, and an investigation of changing Chinese kinship patterns in Java has raised new questions about marriage patterns in southeastern China."

In spite of such intellectually tempting problems, and this menu could readily be expanded from appetizers to rich main courses, it must be admitted that relatively few western scholars have committed themselves to specialized research on the Nanyang Chinese. One reason for this, of course, is that such work requires for the westerner training in both Chinese and Southeast Asian area studies and languages. While it is important to continue our encouragement of western students to undertake these tasks, it is now clear that recruitment may be painfully slow. In this situation, we should obviously look for aid from eastern students, Chinese and Southeast Asian, who start with a linguistic advantage, whose societies must have a continuing interest in Chinese émigrés and their descendants, and whose universities are now providing for their students sophisticated training in the social sciences.

One such student is the author of this present study of Thai-Chinese assimilation in the capital city area of Thailand. Acharn Boonsanong, after receiving his Master's degree in sociology from the University of Kansas, returned to Thailand as a teacher in his country's national university system. Those who know that system will recognize the difficulties that had to be overcome by this young scholar as he planned and executed the original research project reported on in this Data Paper. While he received help and encouragement from many compatriots, the initiative and the persistence which saw the project through

were Khun Boonsanong's, and the entire research operation can be described as strictly Thai, without neglecting the fact that it is also good modern social science. It remains now only that this study should be published in Thai in Thailand, as should all publishable work by younger Thai scholars.

In the meantime we publish this study in English both for its own value and as a good omen for the future of social research in Thailand and for work by local scholars on the Chinese of that country. For while it cannot be assumed that the author himself will continue his interest in the place of the Chinese in Thai society nor even shift it to studies of China proper (in his continuing post-graduate work at Harvard and Cornell he has been acquiring Japanese!), he nonetheless has been responsible for producing a pioneer study in an area of investigation heretofore unpopular in Thailand, and his work must thus be seen as a kind of breakthrough, in a number of respects, for academic Thai research. Thai academia can use the stimulus of such enterprise, and Thailand can use more soundly researched information on its residents of Chinese descent. So the new hope should be expressed that this study may serve as a model for other young scholars in Thailand; and that the Chinese there and theirerole in the development of the nation may become subjects of investigation under the programs of training and social research now being established in Thai universities by modern teachers such as Acharn Boonsanong.

Lauriston Sharp
Director, Cornell Thailand Project

Ithaca, New York
August 1970

PREFACE

This study of Chinese-Thai social assimilation in Bangkok and Thonburi was initiated as a faculty research project in a Thai university primarily with three motives behind it. First, it is my belief that every university teacher has the duty to engage himself constantly in the search for knowledge. In this respect, Thai university teachers, impoverished by their underdeveloped circumstances as they are, need not find research less their duty than anybody else's. Second, it is my desire to encourage and participate actively in international academic cooperation among Thai scholars and their foreign colleagues. On my part, I can only hope to set a small example by presenting my study in a foreign language as well as in my own. In this regard, we should hope that, if international scholarly cooperation is to prosper, foreign scholars with special interest in Thailand will begin to find reason to disseminate their knowledge in the Thai language as well as in their own. Third, there was my own interest in and curiosity about the reality of Chinese-Thai social relations in my own country which, on the one hand, has often been depicted as rosy and unique in Southeast Asia, but, on the other hand, has also been talked about as "problematic." Recently, as a small group of Thai National Assemblymen were touring Taiwan and some of them remarked publicly that they were Thai of Chinese ancestry, they drew sharp and immediate criticism from the Thai press for being disloyal and disgraceful to the dignity of their mother country. Is this sort of journalistic attitude to be considered as prejudicial against Thai of Chinese origin, or benign on the part of "pure Thai" who want to cloak all Chinese with Thai names and manners and make them forget their ancestral origin completely? While *hard* statistics are rarely available (due partly to difficulties of definition) it seems to be widely held among experts that there are few real barriers to Chinese-Thai social assimilation and the rates of intermarriage among them are relatively high. Yet, it is apparent that Chinese in Thailand (even those born within the country) are conspicuously discriminated against in a number of matters and in some public offices and places of learning. (For instance, the difficulties encountered by Thai citizens of Chinese parentage in acquiring immovable property and in entering national military and police academies are well known.)

My hope in this modest study is to help contribute a little further to an understanding of the Chinese-Thai situation in the Thai capital as it is. By studying the "Chinese at home" I hope to spell out the characteristics of those who are assimilated as distinguished from those who are not and to bring to light the channels through which they are and are not assimilated.

Because of the conditions in which research of this type was done or could be done, my research must be considered, by and large, as an exploratory study. Actually, if it were not for reason of unnecessarily crowding the cover page, I would have preferred a longer title for the present report so that a more casual inspector could grasp at a glance the idea about the problem which concerned me. Perhaps I would have preferred a title such as "An exploratory study of the patterns of Chinese-Thai social and cultural interaction and differential Chinese assimilation in Bangkok and Thonburi." However, while it is exploratory in character, it is felt that the information made available in this Data Paper may prove useful to some interested people.*

While I alone am responsible for any possible errors of fact and judgment in this report, my study is in fact the fruit of a truly collective effort. Without the assistance and cooperation of nearly forty individuals, not to count the hundreds of respondents who so generously gave of their time, to whom credit must be distributed, this study could never have been attempted. First of all, I wish to acknowledge gratefully the generous financial support granted me by the Asia Foundation through its Field Representative in Thailand, Mr. William J. Klausner. In this connection, I would like to thank Professor Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen, Dean, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University, for permitting me to undertake this study and lessening my teaching load to a very practical level for one academic year. Dean Adul Wichiencharoen was also kind enough to write a number of letters to various persons and agencies on my behalf which paved the way for my research. The next person to whom I owe much gratitude is Mr. Sawang Ratanamongkolmas, lecturer in the National Institute of Development Administration, who provided competent research assistance to my project throughout the period of fieldwork and whose perseverance and good faith were truly indispensable. He was also among the project members who conducted the most interviews. Then, I would like to record my sincerest appreciation for all the interviewers and helpers in other ways related to the process of my data collection who, unfortunately, are too numerous to mention by name individually.

In America, my study benefited greatly from competent scholars and thoughtful friends of mine. Very gratefully, I wish to acknowledge the kindness of Dr. Nicholas Tavuchis (Department of Sociology, Cornell), Dr. T. Fusé (formerly of the Department of Sociology, Cornell, now of the University of

---

*An example has been laid for possible uses of my data. See Boonsanong Punyodyana, "Later-Life Socialization and Differential Social Assimilation of the Chinese in Urban Thailand," unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, Cornell University.

Montreal), Dr. Graham Johnson (Department of Sociology, University of British Columbia), and Dr. Hans-Dieter Evers (Department of Sociology, Yale University), all of whom read critically earlier drafts of my manuscript and gave valuable comments and suggestions. I also wish to thank my old friend and colleague, Barton Sensenig, 3rd, previously of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., and currently at the Department of Sociology, Cornell, for his assistance in the preparation of some of the tables contained in this report. Mr. Sensenig also found the proper nouns for my three Chinese groups. Finally, but by no means minimally, I want to thank my dear wife Tasaniya whose social background was among the most important sources of my interest in the problem I have chosen to study. Tasaniya has shown true understanding and sympathy for my academic interest and willingly (and patiently) assisted me closely in all phases of my research endeavor. Without my wife's willingness to cooperate my project might never have reached the destination it has.

B.P.

Ithaca, New York
Summer 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

PROBLEMS, PURPOSES, METHODOLOGY AND MAIN RESULTS

Existing research literature about the Chinese minority in Thailand indicates, albeit not always explicitly, that the relations of the Chinese and the Thai bear more attributes of social integration and assimilation than of conflict and polarization, especially as compared with the situation of the Chinese and the indigenous people in other Southeast Asian countries.[1] Yet, as any student of intergroup relations would hasten to suggest, one should not exaggerate the extent or even assume the inevitability of social integration or assimilation of different cultural or ethnic groups which find themselves in physical proximity with one another. Although by comparison with some other countries, Thailand's Chinese may seem well integrated or assimilated into the host society, this process is far from complete. What appear to be signs of happy integration or acculturation may not always lead to assimilation. As Dr. Puey Ungphakorn, an eminent Thai scholar of Chinese background, remarked in an interview which serves as part of the present study, "The process of Chinese-Thai assimilation is a two-way process which in the long run will leave Thai with something Chinese and Chinese with something Thai." It is indeed with this kind of awareness and caution that the present study has been conceived and undertaken. However, on the basis of previous studies as well as our own observation and personal experience, it can be initially granted that there exists a relatively high degree of social integration or assimilation between the Chinese and the Thai people in Thailand. With this initial assumption, this study was initiated with an aim of unveiling further empirical facts about the various patterns of Chinese-Thai social relationships. Obviously, despite the abundance of literature

---

1. Among the major works dealing with the Chinese in Thailand such as G. William Skinner, *Chinese Society in Thailand: An Analytical History* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1957) and *Leadership and Power in the Chinese Community of Thailand* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1958); Victor Purcell, *The Chinese in Southeast Asia*, 2nd edition (London, Oxford University Press, 1965); Virginia Thompson, *Thailand: The New Siam* (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1941); Kenneth P. Landon, *The Chinese in Thailand* (New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941); and Richard J. Coughlin, *Double Identity: The Chinese in Modern Thailand* (Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press, 1960), only the last one portrays a rather negative picture about Chinese-Thai social relations and assimilation.

on this subject, research inquiry into the conditions under which Chinese-Thai social assimilation has taken or is taking place is still far from adequate. Not only is there a great paucity of empirical knowledge about the ways (or patterns) of integration/assimilation of *different social categories* of Chinese into the mainstream of Thai society, if indeed such integration/assimilation has occurred, but also virtually nothing is known about those Chinese who have not been, and probably will never be, integrated/assimilated. This study has addressed itself precisely to such research questions.

The fieldwork for this study was undertaken during the period from November, 1966 to August, 1967 in Bangkok and Thonburi, Thailand. As all subjects of our investigation were Chinese people in the Thai capital (and its twin city), this study may be considered basically as a study of the Chinese in urban Thailand. However, as we did not deal with the Chinese simply as an isolated ethnic group existing in the midst of the majority Thai population as such, but with Chinese-Thai interaction and social assimilation, our study is, therefore, equally concerned with Thai people, Thai culture and Thai society. Briefly, what we purport to account for, or test, in this study, mainly by means of a frequency-controlled field survey, are those hypotheses concerning Chinese-Thai social relations in the urban setting which are *sociological* in character. Such hypotheses will be explicated in the body of the report.

Who Are the Chinese People in Thailand?

The difficulties in distinguishing the Chinese *as a separate social entity* from the Thai would seem to indicate that various proportions of Chinese in Thailand are integrated/assimilated into Thai society in various ways depending on a multitude of factors related to their individual and social backgrounds. When the present study was conceived, it became immediately apparent that there were no simple or ready-made criteria available by which the Chinese in Thailand could be identified. From a series of discussions held with students at Thammasat University (many of whom were native Chinese speakers) and with the project interviewers (all of whom speak Chinese as fluently as they speak Thai), a number of suggestions were derived. These included criteria such as a person's mode of dress, ability to speak Chinese or the trace of Chinese accent with which he speaks Thai, food and eating habits, occupational affiliation, membership in a Chinese clan association, Thai surname with characteristics indicating its Chinese origin, Chinese religion, Chinese citizenship status, place of borth (i.e., in China), etc. Some of the suggested criteria were similar to those used by Skinner to determine the degree of "Thainess" of the Chinese

in Thailand. Skinner introduced a scale of Thainess among Chinese leaders which utilized indicators such as the number of generations a person's family has resided in Thailand, possession of a *bona fide* Thai name, fluency in the Thai language, membership in "essentially" Thai organizations, affiliation with a Thai Government office, etc.[2] If one switched an examination based on these indicators in the opposite direction, that is, to determine *lack* of characteristics of Thainess, one would logically be able to identify Chineseness of a person considered. Some of the criteria suggested by the students and interviewers and those introduced by Skinner are undoubtedly valid. But as none of them proved useful and adequate for the general purpose of identifying the Chinese in Thailand as a whole, none was borrowed and used in the present study.

For the general purpose of this study, a Chinese person in Thai society is defined as "a person born and raised in a family in which both of his parents speak (any dialect of) Chinese as their native language."[3] This definition based upon language, simple as it may seem, provides a unidimensional criterion which makes it possible for us to identify the universe for the study. It is a criterion which places sole reliance upon the cultural background and influence, namely source of early socialization, of the people studied. The *cultural* background of a person can definitely be viewed from the standpoint of a variety of other cultural attributes. A man's primary religious surroundings, economic environment, schooling, parents' education, and other factors like them can all be said to contribute to his culture and socialization. But language is an essentially important element. As the anthropological linguist Edward Sapir explains:

> . . . language has certain psychological qualities which make it peculiarly important for the student of social science. (It is) a perfect symbolic system . . . for handling of all references and meanings that a given culture is capable of, whether these be in the form of actual communication or in that of such ideal substitutes of communication as thinking.[3]

It is the present study's contention that the language which one's parents speak as a native tongue, within the surroundings of which one is born and matures, is a reliable indicator of one's primary identification and frame of reference. The use of the Chinese language as a native tongue by the parents

---

2. *Leadership and Power*, pp. 227 ff.

3. In D. G. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Culture, Language, and Personality* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1965), p. 6.

indicates that a child's socialization, especially in its early stages, takes place within the Chinese culture. Socialization is the process whereby a person becomes a member of his society or social group. It inculcates norms and values within a person and equips him with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make him a more or less capable member of his society.[4] Hence, the language which is spoken within a person's family of orientation provides a significant source of his *primary* cultural as well as social identity and frame of reference.

Language was used as the measure of Chineseness because it is a single but reliable indication in the Chinese-Thai case. By the sole measure of their parents' language the Chinese in Thailand were operationally defined as a culturally distinct aggregate of people. A Chinese person may be born in Thailand and may have never been out of the country. He may have been educated solely in Thai schools where no Chinese is taught and may even occupy an influential position in the Thai Government Service. Clearly, we did not concern ourselves primarily with such terms as citizenship, ethnic Chinese or foreign born as distinguished from Thai born Chinese. Our sole interest was in the Chinese people as determined by their primary Chinese socialization regardless of where it may have taken place.

Research Objectives and Sampling Design

With a universe for investigation defined, we brought out the following problems as our research targets:

1. To find out the relative proportions of various "groups" of Chinese in Bangkok and Thonburi Municipalities who become culturally and socially integrated/assimilated into Thai society;

2. To find out the major cultural and social channels through which Chinese in Bangkok and Thonburi become integrated/assimilated into Thai society.

The first target will be described in connection with the sampling procedure involved. Basically the question that arose was: Who among the Chinese in Bangkok and Thonburi become culturally and socially integrated/assimilated with the Thai and, relative to their social groupings, in what proportions? When the study began to take shape we recognized that the Chinese people in Bangkok and Thonburi could be identified as belonging

---

4. See, for example, Orville G. Brim, Jr., and Stanton Wheeler, *Socialization After Childhood* (New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966), pp. 6-7.

to three predominantly large groups according to their respective social statuses or the social categories with which they were affiliated. These were (1) Chinese whose occupation was trade and commerce, (2) Chinese students in Thai schools and universities, and (3) Chinese employees in the Thai Government Service. But while it would have been possible to investigate these three Chinese groups as they were, we decided to tackle the problem in another way due to two reasons of contingency. First, the student group was composed of people at younger age levels than their counterparts in the other two groups. Secondly, income levels of all these three groups significantly differed. Hence, we drew a quota sample which controlled age, sex, religious affiliation, Chinese dialect, class (as measured by income), and place of residence. Each of the three groups in the sample was represented by exactly three hundred (300) respondents (Table 1.1). As no information either about the size or the composition of the total Chinese population (as we mean in the present study) was available, the population of Bangkok and Thonburi Municipalities as a whole was used as the basis for sampling.[5] The frequency distribution of the Chinese respondents represented in each of the three groups, then, was expected to be an approximately representative sample of the total population of Bangkok and Thonburi Municipalities.[6] Group I and Group II in the sample (Table 1.1) were designed to be differentiated from each other in their educational attainment within the Thai system. Group III, however, was to be differentiated from both Group I and Group II in both the amount of the

---

5. The sample was drawn from the figures available in *Census Report of Thailand B.E. 2503* (Changwad series: Bangkok and Thonburi). In drawing this sample the residents outside of the Municipal boundaries of Bangkok and Thonburi were excluded by means of subtracting the population of the districts which lie beyond the Municipalities from the total population of Bangkok and Thonburi provinces.

6. Since mass Chinese immigration to Thailand has ceased since 1949 it can be assumed that the majority of the Chinese in Bangkok and Thonburi, as defined in this study, in 1966-67 were born in Thailand. This, coupled with the apparent fact that most Chinese by our definition are of Thai nationality either by birth or by naturalization, makes it reasonable to assume that the distribution characteristics of the Chinese population are largely identical with those of the total population of Bangkok and Thonburi. (While it is generally estimated that there are around three million ethnic Chinese in Thailand, the *Population Census, B.E. 2503* reports only less than half a million alien Chinese out of about 30 million total population in Thailand.)

Table 1.1. Tentative Sample

		Group I (N=300)	%	Group II (N=300)	%	Group III (N=300)	%
Sex:	Male	153	51	153	51	153	51
	Female	147	49	147	49	147	49
		300	100	300	100	300	100
Age:	15-24	102	34	102	34	102	34
	25-34	81	27	81	27	81	27
	35-44	48	16	48	16	48	16
	45-54	36	12	36	12	36	12
	55 and over	33	11	33	11	33	11
		300	100	300	100	300	100
Educational attainment:							
	No formal schooling	114	38	-	-		
	Up to 7 years	186	62	-	-		
	8 to 10 years	-	-	210	70		
	11 to 12 years	-	-	69	23		
	Over 12 years	-	-	21	7		
		300	100	300	100		
Dialect:							
	Teochiu	174	58	174	58	174	58
	Hakka	51	17	51	17	51	17
	Hainanese	39	13	39	13	39	13
	Cantonese	21	7	21	7	21	7
	Hokkian	15	5	15	5	15	5
		300	100	300	100	300	100
Religious affiliation:							
	Buddhist/Confucianist	285	95	285	95	285	95
	Christian	15	5	15	5	15	5
		300	100	300	100	300	100
Class (based on income average of each occupational stratum)n*							
	I	192	108	36	108	36	100% (N=192)
	II		20	10	20	10	
	III		43	22.5	43	22.5	
	IV		43	22.5	43	22.5	
	V		43	22.5	43	22.5	
	VI		43	22.5	43	22.5	
			300		300		
Residential zone:n*							
	Zone I		110	37	110	37	110	37
	Zone II		116	38	116	38	116	38
	Zone III		74	25	74	25	74	25
			300	100	300	100	300	100

*See description in Appendix I.

respondent's educational attainment and his occupational affiliation. That is, Group III was to incorporate only the Chinese who were employed in the Thai Government Service in which a person's occupational level is determined largely by his educational background. In Table 1.n1 the breakdown of educational attainment and class composition of Group III is not given because the initial data were unobtainable. Actually, the way Group III was finally obtained somewhat minimized our control over the frequency distribution of the respondents with certain attributes, thus lessening to a degree the comparability of this group and the other two. Nevertheless, when all three groups are comparatively analyzed (Chapter II through Chapter VI), Group III stands out to be clearly distinct from Group I as well as Group II. Therefore, Group III undoubtedly represents a discrete sociological grouping of Chinese people in Bangkok and Thonburi.

Although the sample as shown in Table 1.n1 was a carefully and systematically drawn quota sample, in undertaking the research some further difficulties were encountered which rendered it impossible for the investigator fully to carry out the survey. Consequently, some changes were made during the operation and Table 1.n2 became the final sample, the sample which was actually obtained. The changes which brought about the final sample actually made this sample, in ways, more sensible and realistic. In the final sample, Group I and Group II are identical in their frequency distribution with regard to sex, religious affiliation, Chinese dialect, and place of residence.n7 Group I and Group II are different from each other in the variables of sex, education and class. These differences exist because in Bangkok and Thonburi most Chinese people who have more education are younger than those who have less education. Likewise, none of the better educated belongs to the lowest class or Class VI which comprised laborers. It can be seen that the real characteristics of Group I and Group II were the source of the necessary changes in the sampling design from Table 1.n1 to Table 1.n2. In short, the changes were due to nonexistence of respondents who would meet the requirements of our pre-drawn quota sample as shown in Table 1.n1. When it became known that such people did not exist we revised our strategy and began searching for the respondents by the criteria of their educational attainment. As a result, in the final sample (Table 1.n2) Group I comprises the respondents who have had less than eight years of Thai schooling among whom two-fifths (38%) have not had any formal schooling at all. On the contrary, Group II is composed *only* of the respondents who have had eight or more years of Thai education. In Group III, the government employee group, over

---

7. The word "identical" indicates the lack of a significant difference, namely, a difference at the X^2 value of .05.

Table 1.2. Final Sample

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employees (N=300)		Group II More Educated Non-Government Employees (N=300)		Group III Government Employees (N=300)	
		%		%		%
Sex: Male	157	53	157	53	238	79
Female	143	47	143	47	62	21
	300	100	300	100	300	100
Age: 15-24 years	76	25	124	42	43	14
25-34 years	57	19	97	32	163	54
35-44 years	47	16	49	16	47	16
45-54 years	58	19	18	6	36	12
55 years and over	62	21	12	4	11	4
	300	100	300	100	300	100
Educational attainment:						
No formal schooling	114	38	-	-	-	-
Up to 7 years	186	62	-	-	69	23
8 to 10 years	-	-	204	68	29	10
11 to 12 years	-	-	73	24	44	15
Over 12 years	-	-	23	8	158	52
	300	100	300	100	300	100
Dialect:						
Teochiu	182	60	182	61	192	64
Hakka	56	19	54	18	33	11
Hainanese	36	12	34	11	34	11
Cantonese	21	7	24	8	32	11
Hokkian	5	2	6	2	9	3
	300	100	300	100	300	100
Religious affiliation:						
Buddhist/Confucianist	283	94	283	94	294	98
Christian	17	6	17	6	6	2
	300	100	300	100	300	100
Class (based on income officially reported as associated with each occupation)n:*						
I	105	35	114	37	84	28
II	20	7	33	11	78	26
III	44	15	53	18	93	31
IV	44	15	53	18	28	9
V	43	14	47	16	11	4
VI	43	14	-	-	6	2
	300	100	300	100	300	100
Residential zone:n*						
Zone I	110	37	110	37	98	33
Zone II	116	38	114	38	130	43
Zone III	74	25	74	25	72	24
	300	100	300	100	300	100

*See description in Appendix I.

half (52%) of the respondents have had more than twelve years of Thai education and none is without any formal educatione Group I also consists of people who are in older age categories than those in Group II and, to a lesser extent, Group III. In addition, Group I is the group of Chinese people with higher income than those in Group II. For identification purpose only, henceforthe Group I will be referred to as the "less educatede non-government employee," Group II the "more educated, non-government employee," and Group III the "government employee.e"

As such, in the present study the social characteristics of the three Chinese groups over which we have control constitute the independent variablese And the differing proportions in which respondents in all three Chinese groups are integrated/assimilated into Thai society *through particular cultural and social channels* become the dependent variables. This research study, then, can be considered at the minimum as an exploratory study dealing with *ex post facto* phenomena and attempting to uncover the concomitant variation of these two sets of variables. As an exploratory study, it is hoped that our endeavor will help to shed some more light upon the reality of Chinesee Thai social relations and provide some more concrete grounds for further research not only on this specific problem, but the problem of intergroup relations in other contexts as welle Further, as the present study is also descriptive and informative in character, it is equally hoped that the findings and the description about particular social and cultural channels of Chinese-Thai interaction presented in varying details in succeeding chapters will serve interested scholars in their ree search on the same or similar topics. Below, the meaning of "differing proportions" of social integration/assimilation will be clarified in the description of the "ways" of integration/assimilatione

The second (and related) research target was to explore and bring to light the major ways and patterns in which the different groups (or subgroups) within the total Chinese population of Bangkok and Thonburi become integrated/assimilated into Thai societye The words "ways" and "patterns" of integration/assimilation are used in the context of the cultural and social channels investigated. In the present study the following six cultural and social channels were investigated:

1. The use of the Chinese and/or Thai language as a means of communication in a variety of social situations and the attitudes toward these two languages, their importance and necessity, both at present and in the future.

2. Participation in and attitudes toward Thai educatione

3. Religious practices and attitudes toward Thai and Chinese religions.

4. Occupational affiliation, occupational preference and attitudes toward occupations in Thai society.

5. Actual behaviorand attitudes toward interpersonal association, friendship and choice of friends.

6. Family and marriage practices and attitudes toward intermarriage between Chinese and Thai.

All of these six channels of Chinese-Thai interaction were, thus, considered as indicators of Chinese-Thai social integration/assimilation. In the main, our research results reveal that according to these indicators, the Chinese respondents in all three groups in our sample significantly differ from each other *both in their attitude and actual behavior*. In Table 1.3, which presents only a small token of our findings, it can be seen that the three Chinese groups manifest differential, but consistent, patterns of Thainess or differential integration/assimilation to Thai societyn The less educated non-government employees, compared with the more educated non-government emn ployees, have fewer close Thai friends; speak Chinese more than Thai at home; practice the Chinese cult of ancestor worship more; donate to Thai Buddhist monasteries less; and would prefer Chinese to Thai persons as marriage partners.

To further check our research results, we ran Table 1.4, based on the same indicators except marriage choice, with age as an independent variable. Table 1.n4 confirms that for all indicators within each age group the order of Chinese-Thai social integration/assimilation is from less educated non-government employees to more educated non-government employees to government employees. As such we can infer from our findings that the differences as shown in Table 1.3 were not due to the differences in the sample.

In the next five chapters straight descriptive reports will be made on the detailed results of the field survey. At the end of each chapter, a brief summary and discussion will be given to highlight the main findings of the survey. Except Chapter III, which combines the report on education and occupation under one heading, each chapter deals with a single, more or less separate social and cultural area of Chinese-Thai interaction and integration/assimilation. The final chapter presents an overall view of the findings, both quantitative and qualitative, and an overall evaluation in a certain theoretical context related to the general phenomena of social interaction and assimilation.

Table 1.3. Indicators of Chinese-Thai Differential Social Integration/Assimilation*

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group III Government Employee (N=300) %
A. Close Friends			
More Thais or equal	27	47	76
More Chinese	79	53	24
	100	100	100
B. Language Spoken at Home:			
Thai more than Chinese	24	45	81
Chinese more or both equally	76	55	19
	100	100	100
C. Chinese Ancestor Worship:			
Never practice	6	21	32
Practice sometime	94	79	68
	100	100	100
D. Donate to Thai Monasteries:			
Often or regularly	48	64	82
Seldom or never	52	36	18
	100	100	100
E. Preferred Marriage Partner:			
Thai or both equal	32	53	86
Chinese	68	47	14
	100	100	100

*All X^2 with one degree of freedom are significant at p = .01.

Table 1.4. Indicators of Chinese-Thai Differential Social Integration/Assimilation by Age Categories

	Age	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee		Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee		Group III Government Employee	
		%	Base	%	Base	%	Base
A. Proportion whose close friends are either more Thais than Chinese or about equal	15-24	21	(76)	56	(124)	74	(43)
	25-34	37	(57)	43	(97)	72	(163)
	35-44	19	(47)	36	(49)	81	(47)
	45 and over	15	(120)	38	(30)	89	(47)
B. Proportion who speak Thai more than Chinese at home	15-24	28	(76)	49	(124)	81	(43)
	25-34	32	(57)	55	(97)	77	(163)
	35-44	34	(47)	27	(49)	91	(47)
	45 and over	15	(120)	26	(30)	79	(47)
C. Proportion who never practice ancestor worship	15-24	4	(76)	28	(124)	30	(43)
	25-34	12	(57)	13	(97)	30	(163)
	35-44	9	(47)	20	(49)	52	(47)
	45 and over	5	(120)	19	(30)	20	(47)
D. Proportion who donate to Thai monasteries often or regularly	15-24	49	(76)	65	(124)	81	(43)
	25-34	54	(57)	63	(97)	84	(163)
	35-44	43	(47)	59	(49)	82	(47)
	45 and over	47	(120)	70	(30)	74	(47)

CHAPTER II

DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION THROUGH LANGUAGE

This chapter is concerned with the use of Thai as compared with the Chinese language among Chinese. Adoption of Thai, and the extent of its use, is viewed as an indication not only of acculturation, but also of social assimilation, for, through the Thai language Chinese automatically adopt Thai values, practices and institutions. Our findings show that every Chinese person interviewed speaks Thai, but nearly all of them also speak Chinese. Also, while most speak the Chinese dialect of their parents a sizeable number of them also speak one or more other dialects. Table 2.1 shows that Teochiu, Cantonese, and Mandarin are the most popular dialects in addition to their parents' dialect which the respondents know how to speak. All three groups compared, however, it appears that there are fewer Chinese people in Group III (government employee group) who can speak another dialect in addition to their parents' native dialect. For example, compare the differences between Column I and Column II in the first two rows (Teochiu and Hakka) in all three groups in Table 2.1.

English is claimed by about one third (32.3%) of the respondents in Group II as the foreign language they know how to speak. This undoubtedly testifies to their superior education over Group I in which only less than one out of ten respondents (7.6%) make such a claim. However, it is interesting to note that while over half of the respondents in Group III have had university-level education (namely, twelve or more years) only about one-tenth say they have knowledge of spoken English.

Although a large number of respondents speak one or more additional Chinese dialects besides their parents' mother tongue, the majority of them learned to speak their parents' dialect first and subsequently acquired the rest. This empirical fact furnishes significant proof of the cultural influence of parental language on the respondent's early socialization. Nevertheless, there are many respondents whose first language was not Chinese but Thai and, also, there are Chinese in all three groups who say they grew up bilingual, that is, they learned their parents' Chinese dialect and Thai simultaneously.

Table 2.2 reports some fundamentally important facts about the language of the three Chinese groups in Bangkok and Thonburi investigated, namely:

a. More Chinese in Group III (about half or 52.3%) than

Table 2.1. Per Cent Who Can Speak Various Languages/Dialects and Parents' Native Dialects

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)		Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)		Group III Government Employee (N=300)	
	Language(s)/ Dialect(s) Respondent Speaks (Column I)	Native Chinese Dialect of Respondent's Parents (Column II)	Language(s)/ Dialect(s) Respondent Speaks (Column I)	Native Chinese Dialect of Respondent's Parents (Column II)	Language(s)/ Dialect(s) Respondent Speaks (Column I)	Native Chinese Dialect of Respondent's Parents (Column II)
Teochiu	83.3%	60%	86.3%	61%	75.3%	64%
Hakka	24.6	19	18.0	18	11.0	11
Hainanese	18.3	12	11.3	11	9.3	11
Cantonese	19.3	7	18.8	8	14.0	11
Hokkian	1.6	2	3.0	2	10.6	3
Mandarin	14.3	--	27.0	--	18.3	--
Thai	100.0	--	100.0	--	100.0	--
English	7.6	--	32.3	--	9.6	--
Japanese	.3	--	--	--	--	--
French	--	--	.3	--	--	--
	269.3%	100%	297.0%	100%	248.1%	100%

Table 2.2. Native Chinese Dialect of Respondentes Parents Compared with Language(s)/ Dialect(s) Respondent Learned to Speak First and Language(s)/Dialect(s) Respondent can Speak Now

	Parents' Chinese Dialect			Respondent's First Language(s)/Dialect(s)			Language(s)/Dialect(s) Respondent Can Speak Now		
	Group I (N=300)	Group II (N=300)	Group III (N=300)	Group I (N=300)	Group II (N=300)	Group III (N=300)	Group I (N=300)	Group II (N=300)	Group III (N=300)
Teochiu	55.0%	60.6%	41.6%	61%	60%	64%	86.3%	83.3%	75.3%
Hakka	14.0	15.3	6.6	18	19	11	18.0	24.6	11.0
Hainanese	11.0	12.0	7.3	11	12	11	11.3	18.3	9.3
Cantonese	7.0	7.0	7.3	8	7	11	18.3	19.3	14.0
Hokkian	2.0	1.6	1.0	2	2	3	3.0	1.6	10.6
Mandarin	--	--	--	--	--	--	27.0	14.3	18.3
Thai	22.0	9.3	52.3	--	--	--	100.0	100.0	100.0
English	--	--	--	--	--	--	32.3	7.6	9.6
Japanese	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.3	--
French	--	--	--	--	--	--	.3	--	--
	111.0%	105.8%	116.1%	100%	100%	100%	297.0%	269.3%	248.1%

those in Group II (22%) and Group I (9.3%) said they learned to speak Thai first in their families.

b. Irrespective of the native dialect of their parents, fewer respondents in Group III than in Group II and Group I learned to speak Chinese as their first languagee For example, among the respondents whose parents are Teochiu speakers only two-fifths (41.6%) in Group III say that their first language was Teochiu Chinese as compared with over half (55%) in Group II and three-fifths (60.6%) in Group I.

c. Teochiu ranks first among the dialects other than their parents' native dialect which Chinese in all three groups acquirede In Table 2.2 one can notice that there is a large difference between the percentages of respondents who can speak Teochiu (83.3%) and those who learned it as their first language (66.6%) in Group I (the difference is 22.7%). Likewise, one can see the same kind of difference in Group II (the difference is 27.3%) and Group III (the difference is 33.7%).

Table 2.3 confirms that Teochiu is the most widely spoken Chinese dialect in Bangkok and Thonburie

Table 2.3. Language(s)/Dialect(s) Spoken by the Respondent's Spouse, Brothers/Sisters, and Other Close Relatives Sharing the Same Household

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group III Government Employee (N=300) %
Teochiu	73.3	81e0	62e0
Hakka	23.0	15.3	9.0
Hainanese	17.0	13e6	11.0
Cantonese	13.3	16.3	10.6
Hokkian	3.0	2.0	3.6
Mandarin	15.6	10.3	4.0
Thai	100e0	100e0	100.0
English	16e0	19e0	7.0
Japanese	--	.3	--

Despite the ability of respondents in all three groups to speak Chinese, in their daily life (both at home and outside) those in Group I speak it far more than their counterparts in the other two groups. In Table 2.4 it can be seen that only

five per cent or less of the Chinese in Group III say they speak more Chinese than Thai or speak only Chinese. While Group II consists of a larger number of respondents than Group III who say they speak more Chinese, or speak Chinese mostly or wholly, the vast majority of Chinese speakers are undoubtedly in Group I. Over fifty per cent of the respondents in Group I speak Chinese at home more than they do Thai, but a slightly smaller number of them (about forty per cent) do so when they are outside of their home.

Table 2.4. Language the Respondent Speaks More in His Daily Life

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)		Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)		Group III Government Employee (N=300)	
	At Home	Outside	At Home	Outside	At Home	Outside
Chinese mostly or wholly	10.3%	8.0%	2.6%	-- %	1.6%	.3%
Chinese more than Thai	44.2	31.8	21.0	6.6	4.6	1.6
Chinese and Thai equally	21.3	28.3	31.6	29.0	13.3	4.0
Thai more than Chinese	21.6	27.3	38.8	49.4	49.5	44.0
Thai mostly or wholly	2.6	4.6	6.0	15.0	31.0	50.1
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

It seems that the Chinese in Group I speak Chinese mostly or wholly, both at home and outside, because they find it necessary to do so. In their responses to one of our openeended questions, a large number of this group point out many reasons why it is important or necessary for them to speak Chinese. The following are examples of some of such reasons.

> It's more natural for me to speak Chinese in my family, because we are Chinese.

My parents and older relatives do not like it when I speak Thai to them.

People I see every day are all Chinese. I have to speak Chinese when I deal with them.

Chinese is the business language. If you don't speak Chinese, how can you do business?

I try to speak to my children only in Chinese so that they can learn from me. If they don't know how to speak Chinese they will have very little future in business.

In Table 2.5 it will be seen that over half of the Chinese in Group I (54.7%) find it very necessary or completely necessary for them to speak Chinese in their daily life. However, while slightly less than a quarter (24.2%) of the members of Group II consider it very necessary or completely necessary to speak Chinese in their daily life, Group III contributes only one-sixth (16.6%) of all its membership with the same view. Contrariwise, whereas fewest Chinese in Group I (14.3%) would say it is *not* very necessary or *not* necessary at all for them to speak Chinese in their everyday life, nearly one-third (29.9%) in Group II and over two-thirds (67.8%) in Group III would agree.

Table 2.5. Necessity to Speak Chinese in Everyday Life

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group III Government Employee (N=300) %
Completely necessary	13.0	1.6	1.0
Very necessary	41.7	22.6	15.6
Equally necessary as Thai	31.0	45.9	15.6
Not very necessary	13.3	26.6	42.8
Not necessary at all	1.0	3.3	25.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0

While stating the necessity to speak Chinese in their daily life, over a quarter of all the respondents in Group I also disclose that they do not find it very necessary or necessary at all to speak Thai. This remark is in sharp contrast with the way the Chinese respondents in Group II and Group III put it. Very few in Group II (5%) and none in Group III would say that the Thai language is not necessary for them in their daily life (see Table 2.6).

Table 2.6. Necessity to Speak Thai in Everyday Life

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group III Government Employee (N=300) %
Completely necessary	15.3	29.3	73.8
Very necessary	18.0	26.3	23.6
Equally necessary as Chinese	39.8	39.4	2.6
Not very necessary	21.6	5.0	--
Not necessary at all	5.3	--	--
	100.0	100.0	100.0

A ratio of 4 to 3 of Chinese respondents in Group I to those in Group II (28.4% to 21%) and approximately 3 to 2 of those in Group II to those in Group III (21% to 14.9%) state that the Chinese language is very necessary or completely necessary for their younger relatives. On the other hand, while more than half of all theerespondents in Group III (53.8%) and one-fourth of all the respondents in Group II (26.2%) say that Chinese is *not* very necessary or *not* necessary at all for younger generation Chinese in Thailand to be able to speak, only a tenth of the respondents in Group I (11.6%) would agree (see Table 2.7).

Table 2.7. Opinion Regarding the Importance and Necessity for Children, Grandchildren or Other Close Relatives in the Same Household Who Will Grow up in the Future to be Able to Speak Chinese

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300) %	Group III Government Employee (N=300) %
Completely necessary	2.0	2.0	.6
Very necessary	26.4	19.0	14.3
Equally necessary to know as Thai	60.0	52.8	31.3
Not very necessary	11.0	25.6	39.8
Not necessary at all	.6	.6	14.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0

Summary and Discussion

The fashion of speaking of the three Chinese groups in Bangkok and Thonbury, namely, the relative extent to which they adhere to Chinese and Thai, and their diverse attitudes toward these two languages as reported in this chapter indicate differing but consistent proportions of their assimilation. Group I is more Chinese and less Thai in their linguistic behavior than Group II, and Group II more Chinese and less Thai than Group III. As Teochiu is the Chinese dialect most widely learned by Chinese whose parent's mother tongue is another dialect, more Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than Group III, learned to speak it. In their daily life, more Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than Group III, speak (more) Chinese both at home and outside. More Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than Group III, feel it very necessary or completely necessary that their younger relatives know how to speak Chinese. While some Chinese learned to speak Thai at the same time as they learned Chinese in their families, many learned Thai first and Chinese later. Group III has more people who fall in this category than Group II, and Group II more than Group I.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION AS CHANNELS OF SOCIAL INTERACTION AND DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION

Since we can discern from our findings some kind of close and logical link between Chinese attitudes and behavior with respect to education (namely, Thai education) and their attitude and behavior regarding occupation, these two aspects of Chinese-Thai social interaction and assimilation can, therefore, be fruitfully analyzed together. In the responses to our interview questions aimed at eliciting opinions about the role of education in Thai society, certain thinking and behavior patterns of the Chinese in Bangkok and Thonburi are clearly evidente Almost no one would say that education is worthless, or that it is an unnecessary or unimportant thing. While this kind of rationalistic thinking about education can hardly be interpreted as unusual in the modern world, one ought to perhaps note that it may not have always been characteristic of all or most Chinese people in Thailand, especially when education was understood to be Thai education. It may be remembered that until quite recently many Chinese deliberately avoided sending their children to Thai schools even when no Chinese schools were available. Where and when Chinese schools existed they preferred them to Thai schools. Also, many Chinese were known to prefer keeping their youngsters from attending school for the sake of extra labor for their business and commercial activity. A saying such as "When one sends a child to school one loses money, but if one lets him stay home and work one gains" probably typified the attitude of many older-generation Chinese toward education, particularly Thai education. Of course, on the Thai side it must also be remembered that compulsory education, though formally enforced since the 1920's, began to be appreciably effective only after World War II. Nowadays, as Chinese have come to develop favorable attitudes toward Thai education, as indicated by our data, it is also the time when a notion about the value of formal education has emerged and become widespread in Thai society at large. Thus a possible interpretation regarding the origin of Chinese interest and participation in the educational system of Thailand could be attempted. That is, it has been associated with either or both of these factors: (1) the change in the orientation of the Thai toward education has had its impact upon the perception and attitude of the Chinese in the same direction, (2) the change in the role of Thai education, e.g., adoption of the idea of mass education and increases in educational opportunities, etc., has become a useful avenue of status improvement for members of the Chinese minority in Thailand, especially those sufficiently motivated and in a

position to become integrated/assimilated into the Thai status system.

The statements below are quoted from respondents' answers to a question on the role of education in Thai society. They are among those most frequently made by all three groups and are, doubtlessly, illustrative of Chinese thinking about education today.

> Education gives people a better chance in their jobs.
>
> Education brings prestige and good income.
>
> Education earns a way to society; you get to know more people.
>
> Educated people always rise to high positions. They always get good jobs.
>
> Only people who have high education can attain high ranks in the Government Service.
>
> Education saves one from corrupt people.

An overwhelming majority of Chinese in our sample state that in their families they have either offspring or siblings who are currently attending to have previously attended Thai schools. However, of all three groups, fewer people in Group I say they have or have had such close relatives taking part in the Thai system of education (over a tenth of them have not had any immediate relatives in Thai schools; see Table 3.1). This difference in the educational background of members of the respondent's family points to a degree of differential participation in Thai education of Chinese in Group II and III on the one hand and Group I on the other.

Table 3.1. Per Cent Who Have and Do Not Have Children or Brothers/Sisters Attending Thai Schools Now or Previously

	Groupe I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Have	87.7%	96.7%	95.7%
Do not have	12.3	3.3	4.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Again, although most of the respondents in all three groups who have or used to have closenrelatives attending Thai schools express the opinion that they would like or would have liked to see their relatives enter a university, fewer Chinese in Group I express this desire (68.7% in Group I compared to 89.1% and 82.n1% in Groups II and III respectively, see Table 3.n2).

Table 3.n2. Amount of Formal Schooling in the Thai Systemnof Education the Respondent Would Like or Would Have Liked to See His Children or Brothers/Sisters Attain

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
M.3 or P.7 (7 years in school)	.7%	.3%	3.n3%
M.6 or M.S.3 (10 years in school)	7.3	1.3	4.3
M.8 or M.S.5 (12 years in school)	11.0	6.0	6.0
University or its equivalent	68.7	89.1	82.1
	87.7%	96.7%	95.7%

However, in Table 3.3 below it will be seen that when asked what kind of work they would like to see their close relatives in the same family do, Chinese in Group I appear to have as definite or more definite ideas about this matter as their counterparts in the other two groups. Two-fifths of the respondents in Group I (41.7%) say they would like to see members of their family engaged in trade and commerce as compared to one-fourth (24.7%) and one-fifth (20.7%) of the respondents in Group II and Group III respectively who say the same. About equal proportions, or one-third, of Chinese in Group I and Group II would like to have close relatives as medical doctors while less than half as many in Group III do (34.7% and 35% as contrasted with 16.7%). On the other hand, while approximately one fourth of all respondents in Group III would prefer to see their close relatives in the government service, considerably fewer Chinese in Groups I and II share this attitude (24.3% compared to 11.3% and 8.7% in that order)n. Technical occupations (i.e., engineering and architecture) and employment in business

enterprises are favored (as occupations they would want to see their close relatives follow) by more Chinese in Group II than those in Group I and Group III. In Table 3.3 it can also be seen that there are more Chinese people in Group III (27.3%) than in the other two groups who state that they would prefer to leave the matter of occupational choice with their close relatives to decide upon, instead of suggesting to them or directing them to any particular occupation.

Table 3.3. Occupation(s) the Respondent Would Prefer to See His Offspring or Other Close Relatives Engaged In

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Technical occupation; engineering, architecture	8.0%	16.7%	11.0%
Medical doctor	34.7	35.0	16.7
Teacher, professor	4.0	3.7	4.0
Trade and commerce	41.7	24.7	20.7
Military	4.0	3.0	3.3
Police	3.7	3.7	1.0
Government civil service	11.3	8.7	24.3
Employee in business firm, enterprise	4.7	8.0	1.7
Other (unspecified)	15.0	15.3	27.3
	126.8%	118.8%	110.0%

When faced with a specific question as to whether they would or would not agree with their children if their children made their own choice to study any subject which would qualify them to do what they wanted, for instance, government work, the majority of the respondents in all three groups indicate that they would agree and be willing to support their children (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4. Agreement With and Willingness to Support Close Relatives in the Same Family (Children and Brothers/Sisters) Who Want to Go to School in Order to Prepare Themselves to Become Government Officials

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Completely agree and willing to support	24.0%	31.0%	30.3%
Somewhat agree and willing to support	42.7	28.3	35.0
Indifferent, no opinion	19.7	24.3	20.3
Somewhat disagree and unwilling to support	12.3	12.7	10.7
Completely disagree and unwilling to support	1.3	3.7	3.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

While some respondents seem to be inclined to particular purposes in their support of their younger relatives' education, e.g., to prepare them to become government officials, the majority would agree to support education for the sake of education *per se*. Some have explained their willingness to grant their youngsters free educational choice as follows.

> You cannot force people to do (learn) what they don't have the talent for.
>
> It doesn't matter very much what one studies; as long as one has an education it is good enough.
>
> One must build a house according to the will of its occupant; I would let my children study in whatever field they choose or do whatever kind of work they want to as long as it is a lawful and morally right job.
>
> Government or non-government jobs make no difference to me provided my children or grandchildren have

enough education to take care of themselvesnand their families.

Quite interestingly, up to one-third of the Chinese in all three groups view employment in the Thai Government Service in terms of monopoly by Thai, and Chinese people have "no chance whatsoever to get government jobs." Table 3.5 testifies that this attitude is shared equally by the Chinese who themselves are employed by the Thai Government. It may be worth notingn that respondents in Group III who work in government enterprises such as the Thailand Tobacco Monopoly and the Telephone Organization of Thailand do not consider themselves as having the status of the government "official" but only that of the government "employee," even though on the average they receive higher salaries from the Thai Government than those whom they regard as government "officials."

Table 3.5. Agreements and Disagreements on Whether "Government Jobs are Monopolized by Thai and Chinese People Have No Chance Whatsoever to Get Them."

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Completely agree	4.7%	7.0%	10.0%
Somewhat agree	24.3	23.7	17.0
Indifferent	7.0	6.7	3.3
Somewhat disagree	46.3	37.6	37.4
Completely disagree	17.7	25.0	32.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Definitely, there exists within the Chinese community a strong sense of occupational division of labor between the Chinese and the Thai. It is clearly evident in the interview responses which point in a matter-of-fact way to an *a priori* state of affairs in which some occupations are Chinese occupations and others Thai occupations. Furthern, it seems largely taken for granted that Thai should do certain kinds of work and Chinese other kinds.

Close to three-fourths of the respondents in Group I and Group II (74.7% and 71.6%, respectively) say that they agree or completely agree with the statement that Chinese master greater skills in trade and commerce than Thai, hence, Chinese should be engaged in this type of occupation (rather than others). Although Group III has a smaller number of respondents who share this opinion, well over half of them (58.3%) think the same about the Chinese in Thailand relative to trading and commercial occupation (see Table 3.6).

Table 3.6. Agreements and Disagreements Concerning the Statement, "Chinese People Should be Engaged in Trade and Commerce Since It is the Occupation for Which They Master Greater Skills."

	Group I Less Educated Non-Governmente Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Completely agree	27.3%	15.3%	17.0%
Somewhat agree	47.4	56.3	41.3
Indifferent	10.3	11.0	12.0
Somewhat disagree	12.0	15.7	21.3
Completely disagree	2.0	1.7	9.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Moreover, more than half of the respondents in Group I and Group II (Group I slightly more than Group II) state that they somewhat agree or completely agree with the notion that "Trade and commerce in Thailand will always remain a Chinese occupation" (see Table 3.7).

Interestingly, among the reasons given by respondents who say that government employment is monopolized by Thai and Chinese have no opportunity in it are such statements as, "Thai people prefer to be government officials"; "Thai people are not industrious and honest enough to do business"; and "Chinese are not interested in government jobs," etc. Such statements are indicative of Chinese ethnocentrism and disclose stereotypes about Thai among Chinese. In voicing their agreement with the idea that Chinese should do business (i.e., engage in trade and

Table 3.7. Agreements and Disagreements Concerning the Statement, "Trade and Commerce in Thailand Will Always Remain a Chinese Occupation."

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Completely agree	19.0%	12.7%	14.3%
Somewhat agree	40.1	40.0	18.7
Indifferent	8.3	12.3	3.7
Somewhat disagree	23.3	22.0	40.0
Completely disagree	9.3	13.0	23.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

commerce) because they are more skillful than Thai, respondents give reasons such as the following:

> Trade and commerce fit well with the character of the Chinese people.
>
> Chinese are not afraid to take risks in business.
>
> Chinese merchants do not hesitate to invest a large sum of money.
>
> Chinese traders are hospitable and generous to their customers.
>
> Chinese traders are patient with their customers.
>
> Chinese are gifted merchants.
>
> Trade and commerce are our ancestors' business.
>
> Chinese people are industrious.
>
> Chinese people are good businessmen because they know how to save and are willing to save.
>
> Most Chinese people have grown up in business surroundings. They have accumulated their experience from their childhood.

> Chinese are forced to earn their living in trade and commerce because most other occupations are restricted to them.
>
> Chinese people have to do business, because they have no land to till and no citizenship status or education to qualify themselves to work with the government.

About the Thai occupation of government service, a considerably large number of respondents in Group I (about two-fifths or 41.7%) by comparison with those in Groups II and III state that they agree or completely agree with the idea that Thai should concentrate on it and should *not* involve themselves in trade and commerce, a predominantly Chinese occupation (see Table 3.8).

Table 3.8. Agreement and Disagreement Concerning the Notion that the Thai People Should Be Government Officials and Should Not Involve Themselves in Trade and Commerce

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Completely agree	5.3%	3.0%	4.7%
Somewhat agree	36.4	25.0	13.7
Indifferent	18.3	16.3	7.0
Somewhat disagree	35.0	46.9	47.3
Completely disagree	5.0	9.7	27.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The following are some of the points made by Chinese about Thai and government employment:

> Government work is the work of Thai people, Thai people should do it.
>
> Thai have contacts (*phûak*) and relatives (*yâat*) in the government; so, it's easy for them to enter and be part of it.

Thai cannot compete with Chinese in businesse

Thai educate themselves to be officials.

Thai are not industrious and patient enough for businesse

Thai like government jobs because they love to have and enjoy prestigee

On the other hand, those who disagree that Thai should only work for the government and do nothing else make these commentse

Thai can do business tooe

If Thai don't go into business, this line of work will always remain dominated by alien peoplee

There are many Thai who are industrious and patient who can do business welle

It's up to individual people, whether Thai or Chinese, who want to do any kind of work. Whatever anyone wants to do he should be able to do ite

Anybody who has enough money and will can start his own business and doesn't have to depend on government work onlye

It's up to the skill and talents of individual people regardless of nationalitye

Nearly two-thirds (61.3%) of the respondents in Group I name "trade and commerce" as the occupation they would choose if they were to choose an occupation of their own likinge Of course, this is already the occupation of most of theme However, a sizable number of respondents in Groups II and III also state their preference for trade and commerce (39% and 40.3% respectively)e This noticeably large number of respondents who are not primarily engaged in trade and commerce (particularly those in Group III) who voice their preference for this occupation probably signifies that motivation is not altogether lacking among non-business people for entering into the world of business which is claimed by many respondents to be an exclusively Chinese occupation. At the same time, it is noticeable that only a small number, i.e., only a quarter of the respondents in Group III (26.3%) say they would choose government service if they could choose an occupation of their own liking, and even smaller proportions of those in Groups I and II would say the same (6e7% and 4.3% respectively). Medical doctor, technical occupations (e.g., engineering and architecture), teacher, personnel in a

business firm or enterprise are among the occupations less strongly favored by Chinese in all three groups (see Table 3.9). In view of the prevalent notion that the Chinese in Thailand (whom some people sometimes refer to as an "aggressive minority") have high regard for "technical professions," it does seem surprising that our data does not indicate strong support for this. But a further analysis could be done in the light of what we have learned to be the respondent's wish regarding his offspring's career (Table 3.3 above). While a relatively small proportion of Chinese in each group would elect medicine as *their own* career, a much larger proportion of them (e.g., more than three times in Group I) name it as a preferred career for their offspring. At the same time, more respondents in all three groups consider trade and commerce as a preferred career *for themselves rather than for their offspring*, and more prefer trade and commerce to medicine as their *own* career. Presumably, this indicates that while Chinese parents (in lesser or greater proportion according to their social group affiliation) prefer trade and commerce as their own career they would rather see their offspring in a more prestigious and less risky profession such as medicine.

Table 3.9. Respondent's Occupational Preference.

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Technical occupation, engineering, architecture	10.0%	14.0%	15.3%
Medical doctor	9.7	16.7	9.3
Teacher, professor	8.0	14.3	13.3
Trade and commerce	61.3	39.0	40.3
Military	3.7	.7	3.7
Police	2.0	.3	1.3
Government civil service	6.7	4.3	26.3
Employee in business firm, enterprise	9.7	11.0	6.7
Other	8.0	5.7	10.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Summary and Discussion

The data reported in Chapter III furnish overwhelming evidences that Chinese in Groups II and III bear greater similarity to one another than to their counterparts in Group I with regard to their attitude toward and actual participation in the Thai educational system and also, in large part, their attitude toward education as an avenue to certain occupations in Thai society. For instance, more Chinese in Groups II and III than in I have or used to have their children or brothers/sisters attend Thai schools. But less in Groups II and III than in I want to see their children or brothers/sisters follow the trading and commercial occupation. Likewise, less in Groups II and III than in I would prefer to choose for themselves trade and commerce as their occupation (although it is also true that less in Groups II and III than I are of the opinion that Thai should concentrate themselves on government employment and should not be involved in trade and commerce at all).

Notwithstanding the above findings, however, in certain other aspects of their attitude and behavior pertaining to occupation, Chinese in Group II manifest a closer identity to their less educated counterparts in Group I. For example, more Chinese in Groups II and I than III believe that Chinese people in Thailand should engage themselves in trading and commercial activity and predict that trade and commerce in Thailand will always remain a predominantly Chinese occupation or under Chinese control. Thus, whereas their similar educational status serves to identify Chinese in Group II and Group III together in certain aspects of their behavior and attitude, their different occupational statuses differentiate them in others. However, in each aspect of behavior and attitude investigated it is clear that the three Chinese groups demonstrate different proportions of integration/assimilation into Thai society.

This chapter also reports and interprets some data on Chinese views regarding professional careers, particularly medicine. It has been noted as plausible that although a profession like medicine may be considered by many a Chinese as an ideal career it is realistically viewed as a possible avenue of upward mobility only for the younger generation rather than for those already engaged in another occupation or who have embarked upon another line of training.

CHAPTER IV

CHINESE AND THAI RELIGIONS, RELIGIOUS PRACTICES, AND DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION

In Thailand, both in rural and urban (commercial) settings such as Bangkok and Thonburi, religious customs and religious practices of people are usually overt and easy to witness. To a very large extent, such overt religious behavior enables an observer to readily identify the cultural and ethnic affiliation of the Chinese and the Thai people involved in it. For instance, it can always be said that people who wear white dresses to mourn death and burn red- and golden-colored papernat the cemetery where they *bury* the body are Chinese. On the other hand, people who wear black and cremate rather than bury the body at the cemetery are Thai. (Usually in Bangkok and Thonburi cemeteries or crematoriums are located on or near the compound of Buddhist monasteries.) Those who burn incense sticks on the sills of their doors and windows and in front of their houses are Thai. People who worship at Mahayana Buddhist temples or Confucian shrines are Chinese, but those who worship at Theravada Buddhist monasteries are Thai. Undoubtedly, a listing of such differences in the overt religious behavior or religious ceremonies and rituals of the Chinese and the Thai can be expanded without difficulty. The above examples ought to suffice to demonstrate that overt religious differences afford us a reliable indicator of Chinese as contrasted with Thai cultural and social group affiliation.

Because of its pre-tested value we used the above-mentioned indicator to measure the extent of Thainess, i.e., the amount of religious behavior and religious attitude of each of the three Chinese groups which is Thai in character. Our concern in this chapter, therefore, is to report the results of the investigation of the proportion of Chinese in each group who become integrated/assimilated into Thai society through the religious channel of social interaction.

Our findings significantly point out the differential social integration/assimilation of Chinese through religion. That is, the religious behavior of Chinese in our sample falls on a continuum of extremes ranging from complete or near complete Chineseness to complete or near complete Thainess with various degrees of moderation in between. Without any doubt, such findings adequately verify the validity and reliability of religious behavior as a measure of Chinese-Thai social integration/assimilation.

As can be expected, a certain number of Chinese respondentse in *all* three groups manifest Thainess in their religious or religiously oriented behavior. They do, however, differ from each other across group lines in the proportion of their Thainess or their integration/assimilation into Thai society.

From Table 4.1 it is evident that Group I ranks highest in the proportion of respondents adhering to the traditional Chinese filial piety, seconded by Group II with Group III tailing at the bottom of the scale. That is, over nineeout of ten Chinese respondents in Group I are engaged in ancestor and/or spirit worshipping (93.7%) and approximately eight in every ten respondents in Group II (78.7%) and seven in every ten in Group III (68.3%) respectively are ancestor/spirit worshippers. Among respondents in all three groups who say they practice the cult of filial piety, however, those in Group I do it more seriously, that is, more frequently than their counterparts in Groups II and III (28% of respondents in Group I worship twice a month and 12.7% worship daily by comparison with less than 10% of the people in Groups II and III who worship twice a month or every day).

Table 4.1. Per Cent of Respondents Practicing Filial Piety and the Frequency with Which They Worship

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Yes, every day	12.7%	4.3%	2.3%
Yes, twice a month	28.0	8.0	7.7
Yes, at every ceremony (twice a year)	53.0	66.4	58.3
No, not at all	6.3	21.3	31.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

While more than one-fourth of the respondents in both Group I and Group II (27.3% in each) say they never "make merit" by presenting alms to the Buddhist priest (i.e., Thai Buddhist priest), only a tenth (9.7%) of those in Group III say so. Of all the people in each group who say they do present alms to the priest, nearly twice as many in Group II (47%) and well over

twice as many in Group I (51%) say they only do it infrequently. By contrast, among the respondents in Group III who say they present alms to priests, about the same number say they do it often (43.6%) as those who say they do it infrequently (44.6%)t Howevert in all three Chinese groups about three per cent regularly make merit by presenting alms to the priest (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Per Cent Who Do and Do Not Make Merit by Presenting Alms to the Thai Buddhist Priest and the Frequency with Which They Do

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Yes, most regularly	2.7%	3.0%	2.7%
Yes, often	19.0	22.7	43.0
Seldom	51.0	47.0	44.6
No, not at all	27.3	27.3	9.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Although very few Chinese in all groups (less than 1% in Group III and no more than 6% in Groups I and II) say that they have *never* made donations to a Thai Buddhist monastery (*wat*), close to half (46.0%) in Group I and a third (31.0%) in Group II in fact seldom donate. On the other hand, while three-fifths (60.7%) of the respondents in Group III say that they donate to the *wat* often, only about half of those in Group II (49.0%) and slightly over two out of five in Group I (43.0%) say so. Likewise, two-fifths of the respondents in Group III (21.3%) give donations to the *wat* regularly, but noticeably fewer in Groups I and II (5.0% and 14.7% respectively) do the same (Table 4.3).

About twice as many Chinese in Group III as in Groups I and II (37.3% compared to 18.7% and 18.3%) say that they completely agree with the Buddhist notion that entering the priesthood is a way to pay moral debts to one's parents. Nevertheless, almost half (45.3%) of all respondents in Group II and over one third (35.6%) in Group I state that they "somewhat" agree with this Buddhist belief. All in all, it can be said that Group III has the most respondents who believe that entering the priesthood

Table 4.13. Per Cent Who Do and Do Not Make Donations to the *Wat* (such as on the occasion of *thôd kathĭn*, *thôdphâpà* festival, on *wanphra* and in helping to build, repair and maintain a *wat*'s property) and the Frequency with Which Donations Are Made

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Yes, most regularly	5.0%	14.7%	21.3%
Yes, often	43.0	49.0	60.7
Seldom	46.0	31.0	17.3
No, not at all	6.0	5.3	.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4.14. Per Cent Agreeing and Disagreeing with the General Belief that Entering the Buddhist Priesthood is a Way to Pay Moral Debts to Oneřs Parents.

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=283)*	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=283)*	Group III Government Employee (N=294)*
Completely agree	18.7%	18.3%	37.3%
Somewhat agree	35.6	45.3	31.0
Indifferent	29.7	21.0	11.7
Somewhat disagree	10.0	11.7	8.7
Completely disagree	6.0	3.7	11.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Christians in the sample not asked.

is a way to pay moral debts to one's parents (to note, the meaning of this concept largely coincides with showing respect or expressing gratitude). Group II ranks next to Group III and Group I ranks lowest in number of respondents saying that they either somewhat agree or completely agree that entering the priesthood is a method of paying one's moral debts to one's parents. It is noticeable, nonetheless, that the total number of Chinese in Group I who voice any degree of agreement with this Thai Buddhist notion is quite large (see Table 4.4). It can also be read from Table 4.4 that while only about one-tenth (11.7%) of respondents in Group III are indifferent about this general belief, about twice as many Chinese in Group II (21%) and three times as many in Group I (29.7%) share this "indifferent" attitude.

Despite Basic differences in their tenets and rites, Buddhism and Confucianism as religious doctrines have fused together in the belief and ritual system of the Chinese in Thailand to such an extent that they are no longer completely separable. In our interviews we found that while the majority of the respondents identified themselves as Buddhists they also informed us that they adhered to Confucianist rites and customs at the same time. On the other hand, many Chinese who referred to their religion as "Chinese" or "Confucianist" religion also said they believed in Buddhism and worshipped in the Buddhist way as well. It is in view of this religious "syncretism" that we decided to consider Chinese Buddhists and Confucianists as belonging to the same religious category.

Among Buddhist/Confusianist male Chinese respondents, slightly less than half (44.8%) say they have been in the Buddhist priesthood. By comparison, less than one third (29.4%) and only about one fourth (24.5%) of those in Group II and Group I respectively say they have been ordained (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5. Per Cent Who Have and Have Not Been in the Buddhist Priesthood

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=155)*	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=148)*	Group III Government Employee (N=234)*
Yes	24.5%	29.4%	44.8%
No	75.5	70.6	55.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Females and Christians not asked.

Of all Buddhist/Confucianist Chinese males who say they have never been priests almost four out of five in Group III (40.7%) say that if they had an opportunity to be ordained they would like to do so. About four in every seven respondents in Group II (42.3%) express this wish. Although Group I includes the smallest number of people who have not been in the priesthood but, if there was an opportunity open to them, would like to enter (36.9% of the respondents interviewed), the sheer number of respondents who express this desire (i.e., nearly half of all interviewed) signifies a notable proportion of religious value integration of even the most Chinese group into Thai society (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6. Per Cent Who Have Not Been in the Buddhist Priesthood Who Would and Would Not Like to Enter If They Had an Opportunity to Do So

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=148)*	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=155)*	Group III Government Employee (N=234)*
Yes, would like to enter	36.9%	42.3%	40.7%
No, would not like to enter	38.6	28.3	14.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Total male Buddhist/Confucianist respondents.

Among the major reasons underlying the respondent's decision to enter the priesthood or his wish to enter are such as the following.

> To be in the priesthood even for a short period of time is a good way to show respect and gratitude or to pay moral debts to your parents who have brought you up.
>
> Being in the priesthood gives you a good opportunity to study the *Dharma*.
>
> Being a priest enables a person to live in a peaceful state of mind and emotion. It improves a person's mind (mental health).

It's a good experience.

I have faith in Buddhist teachings. Entering the priesthood makes a man a full man.

It's a meritorious deed. The priesthood teaches people to know and appreciate what are right things and what are wrong. It improves a man's quality.

It is a good tradition to follow. Once you have been in the priesthood you can say that you have obeyed the tradition.

I was ordained because I wanted to please my parentse

On the other hand, the reasons which underlie the respondent's lack of interest in becoming a priest are expressed in such statements as followse

It's a useless thing to doe

I am not devout in religion. I am not interested in religion.

I have no specific reasons for wanting to be a priest.

I have to earn a living for myself and my family. Being in the priesthood is a waste of time and money. I do not want to live in complacency as in the priesthood.

I do not have to be a priest to be able to learn about religion.

I am too old nowe I have missed the buse

Chinese don't enter the priesthood. It is a purely Thai custom. Chinese tradition does not call for entrance into the priesthood.

I don't believe in beingea priest in order eto abide by the tradition.

Many priests today do not themselves set a good example. I am not convinced that being a priest would make me better.

When Chinese are ordained they remain ordained permanently, not just for a short period of time. I don't agree with the way many Thai people do it, going in and coming out at whim.

Despite the negative attitude of some male respondents toward the priesthood as reported above, when asked whether they would like to see their close male relatives ordained if their relatives should have a chance to do so, a large majority of Chinese in all three groups (males and females) give a positive answer. Nonetheless, from Table 4.7 it is evident that the number of respondents who say "yes" to this question varies proportionately from Group I through Group III.

Table 4.7. Per Cent Who Would and Would Not Like to See Their Sons, Brothers or Other Close Male Relatives Ordained as Buddhist Priests

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Yes	66.0%	77.0%	94.3%
No	34.0	23.0	5.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

While most of the reasons the respondent gives for wanting or not wanting (namely, agreeing or disagreeing) to have his close male relatives ordained are reminiscent of the respondent's reasoning about himself (for entering the priesthood or remaining in the laity) as reported above, some reasons for "wanting" are fundamentally different and seem to indicate the respondent's greater willingness to let his younger relatives integrate into the Thai religious and ritual system. These are reasons such as follows.

Nobody in my family has been in the priesthood yet, therefore, I should like to see someone in.

To be in the priesthood for a while would make my son adjust to the environment better.

If they want to do it, it is up to them.

They say if one has a relative in the priesthood one would gain merit. Isn't it true?

It's a good way to learn Thai customs and tradition.

We are also Buddhists, therefore, some of us should be ordained.

A little over two-fifths (42.7%) of the Chinese in Group III say that it is better and correct to worship Buddha or the Triple Gems in the *wat* than to worship their ancestors' spirits (at home or at the shrine). However, only one-fifth (20.0%) of their counterparts in Group II and slightly over a tenth (13.3%) in Group I share this opinion. On the contrary, while about one out of four respondents in Group I (24.7%) state that it is better and correct to worship their ancestors' spirits than to worship Buddha, only a very small proportion of those in Group II and Group III (2.7% and 1.3% respectively) agree. But despite conflicting beliefs, it is evident that the majority of respondents in all three groups point out that both (Chinese and Thai) ways of worshipping are equally good and correct (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8. Per Cent Who Say It Is Better and Correct to Worship Buddha or the Triple Gem in the *Wat* Compared with Those Who Say It Is Better and Correct to Worship the Ancestor's Spirit (at Home or at the Shrine) and Those who Say It Is Equally Good and Correct to Worship at the *Wat* and at the Shrine*

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Better and correct to worship in the wat (Because I am a Buddhist; Buddhist priests are real, ancestors' spirits are invisible; By worshipping in, and donating to, the *wat* you render assistance not only to Buddhism but particularly to the priests and the *wat*; Worshipping the ancestors' spirits helps no one; Only old people worship the ancestors now; Ancestor worship is unreasonable; Buddhism is more reasonable.)	13.3%	20.0%	42.7%

Table 4.8 (continued)

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Both ways are equally good and correct (Both are correct traditions; It's up to people's choice, but they can worship both ways; They are not conflicting ways; Younger Chinese people tend to worship Buddhist priests, old ones tend to adhere to their old customs; Either way you worship, if it makes you feel happy and mentally at peace you gain the same reward.)	50.3	71.0	48.0
Better and correct to worship the ancestor's spirit or worship in the shrine (It's a Chinese custom; It's our ancestors' way; It's the way my parents have taught me to do.)	24.7	2.7	1.3
Other (I do not worship in either way; I am not interested in worshipping; I am a Christian; It's better to donate your wealth to poor people who need it than to give it to the *wat* or the shrine.)	11.7	6.3	8.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Ancestor worship is mostly practiced as a family affair at home, but it is also done at several Chinese shrines in Bangkok and Thonburi.

As many as three-fifths of all the respondents in Group I (60.7%) and only less than one-fifth of those in Group III (17.7%) believe that burial is the right kind of tradition people should follow in the ceremony they hold for their deceased relatives. Slightly less than half (46.3%) of the Chinese in Group II share this belief. On the other hand, while as many as four out of five respondents in Group III (79.3%) say that they believe cremation of the remains is the right tradition which would be practiced, less than half of those in Group II (45.7%) and only one-third of those in Group I (32.3%) say they have that belief (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9. Per Cent Who Believe Burial Is the Right Funeral Tradition Compared to Those Who Believe Cremation Is Right

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Burial is right and should be practiced (It is in keeping with our Chinese tradition; It's nicer and less cruel to bury the dead body than to burn it; It's painful to see your loved ones burned; I would feel as though I myself were tortured if someone I know were gotten rid of by fire in the crematorium; Once the body of your deceased friend or relative is burned, there is nothing left for you to remember; Everything seems to come to an end at the burning ceremony; The burial tradition leaves many things for people who stay behind; Each year Chinese have a reunion to remember their deceased relatives; It's considered a show of respect to your deceased relatives when you follow the burial tradition.)	60.7%	46.3%	17.7%

Table 4.9 (continued)

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Cremation is right and should be practiced (It's economical; Its practical; Its convenient and does not leave you with much ceremony to perform after it's over; It's a good way to prevent the spread of diseases; It's the Thai way; Burial requires so much amount of land; Nowadays you have to think in economic terms, not just tradition; Its senseless to grieve by keeping the dead body forever.)	32.3	45.7	79.3
Uncertain about which way is right and should be practiced (Entombment is an ancient Chinese tradition, cremation is a Thai and modern Chinese tradition; Both traditions are good, it's up to individual people to choose; People who can afford it can build a tomb, but it's all right to cremate.)	1.3	2.3	1.0
Burial according to the Christian tradition	5.7	5.7	2.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Although burial or entombment is a traditional Chinese practice and cremation traditionally Thai, many Chinese in Thailand at present have abandoned their tradition and adopted the Thai way. Our findings as reported above provide an abundant testimony to this observation. However, in crematory services held by Chinese people for their deceased relatives in *wats* in

Bangkok and Thonburi the Chinese also perform rites which are distinctly Chinese in origin and content. For example, while summoning Buddhist priests to chant at the crematory ceremony (which is a Thai way of conducting an affair like this and is not done in a strictly Chinese ceremony) the Chinese also perform their silver- and gold-paper burning rite and display big black Chinese characters printed on white cloth. On occasion, they also explode firecrackers after the priests complete chanting and as the cremation of the corpse is about to begin. Undoubtedly, Chinese ritualistic behavior observed in a traditional Thai ceremonial setting such as this testifies to an overt admixture of Chinese and Thai customs. This admixture of customs, consequently, provides grounds for understanding the findings such as reported in Table 4.10 below.

When asked specifically "When a person in your family happens to pass away, which tradition does your family usually follow?" a large proportion of respondents in all three groups answered with the phrase "partly Chinese and partly Thai." Of all three groups, however, Group II has the greatest number of people who responded to this question with this answer (51.7%), followed by Groups I and III which share approximately equal numbers of respondents in this category (40.0% and 42.7% respectively). On the other hand, while as many as a third (33.0%) of all respondents in Group III reveal that their families usually follow the "purely Thai" tradition, only a very small proportion of those in Groups I and II share this experience (3.3% and 6%). However, while only about a fifth of the Chinese in Group III (22.3%) say their families usually follow the "purely Chinese tradition" as many as half of all those in Group I (51.0%) say their families do. The proportion of respondents in the "purely Chinese" category in Group II (35.0%), again, falls in between that of Group I and Group III (see Table 4.10).

Table 4.10. Per Cent Whose Families Follow Thai and Chinese Funeral Practices

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Purely Chinese	51.0%	35.0%	22.3%
Partly Chinese and partly Thai	40.0	51.7	42.7
Purely Thai	3.3	6.0	33.0
Other	5.7	7.3	2.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Summary and Discussion

In this chapter the differing proportions of Thainess and Chineseness of the three Chinese groups are visible in their religious practices and attitudes toward religious customs and ritual. Group I is most Chinese and least Thai in virtually all respects of their religious behavior and religious orientation; Group II is intermediate between Group I and Group III; and the latter is the most Thai and least Chinese of all three groups.

There are more Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than in Group III, who are adherents to and frequent worshippers of the Chinese cult of filial piety. On the other hand, less Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and less in Group II than in Group III, make merit by presenting alms to (Thai) Buddhist priests and donating to the *wat*. Less Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and less in Group II than in Group III, agree or completely agree with the (Thai) Buddhist notion that entrance to the priesthood is a way to pay moral debts to one's parents. Less Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and less in Group II than in Group III, have been ordained in the (Thai) Buddhist priesthood. Less Chinese in Group I than in Groups II and III would want to be ordained even if they might have an opportunity to do so.

More Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than in Group III, believe that it is better and more correct to worship ancestors' spirits or worship at the shrine than to worship at the *wat*. More Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than in Group III, believe that burial of the dead is the right tradition which people should follow. Finally, more Chinese in Group I than in Group II, and more in Group II than in Group III, belong to a family in which a purely Chinese practice is followed when someone deceases.

CHAPTER V

DIFFERENTIAL INTERPERSONAL ASSOCIATION AND ASSIMILATION

The research findings to be presented in this chapter concern the patterns of extra-familial interpersonal (social) contacts, friendship and choice of friends among the Chinese in the three groups investigated. Similar to other social and/or cultural aspects of Chinese-Thai interrelations treated in previous chapters, it was presupposed that the behavior and attitudes of the Chinese with respect to this particular facet could be investigated and, thereby, the relative amount and proportions of their integration/assimilation into Thai society determined. From our findings derived on this basis, we are able to show below the differing proportions of Chinese in all three groups who do and do not manifest interpersonal association at various levels of intimacy with Thai (i.e., are and are not integrated/assimilated into Thai society through interpersonal interaction).

Over half of all Chinese in Group I revealed that among the people with whom they come in contact every day are more Chinese than Thai (9.3% say they see "lots more" Chinese and 44.3% say they see "more Chinese"). By comparison, nearly two out of five (38.7%) of the respondents in Group II say they see "more" Chinese or "lots more" Chinese than Thai in their daily life. Of the Chinese in Group III, however, only about one in every twenty (6.4%) see more Chinese than Thai people in their daily routine while, on the other hand, over seven out of ten of them (73.6%) say they are in contact with more Thai than Chinese everyday. Quite the contrary, only 15.7% of the Chinese in Group I and 20.6% of those in Group II say they see more Thai than Chinese daily (see Table 5.1 below).

As the interview question on the basis of which the above information was secured was written so as to let the respondent define "Thai" and "Chinese" according to his own frame of reference, some respondents may have taken as Chinese any person who had any trade of Chinese ancestry or even Chinese "physical appearance" as *they* saw it. But others may have been unwilling to consider any person as Chinese short of his demonstrated ability to communicate in fluent Chinese. Still others may have thought of all Thai citizens irrespective of their ethnic origin as Thai and only alien Chinese as Chinese. The task of defining a Chinese and a Thai person in Thailand is not an easy one as already discussed in Chapter I. Fortunately, such possible arbitrariness in the respondent's definition presents no

Table 5.1. Proportions of Thai and Chinese People with Whom the Respondent Usually Comes in Contact in Everyday Life

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Lots more Chinese	9.3%	1.3%	.7%
More Chinese	44.3	37.4	5.7
About the same	30.7	40.7	20.0
More Thai	14.7	20.0	62.6
Lots more Thai	1.0	.6	11.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

problem to the present study. Whatever may be the variation in individual definitions of "Thai" and "Chinese," our interest at this point lay in the question: "Who the respondent perceived his daily contacts to be?" rather than "What those contacts actually are?" (again, according to what and whose criteria?).

Regardless of how they actually defined Chinese and Thai, the three Chinese groups in our study demonstrate different patterns of interpersonal, extra-familial relations or association with the people they called Thai. Similar to what has been reported above, when asked "Among your friends with whom you usually do things or go places, are there more Chinese or more Thai people?" Group I ranks top in number of respondents who say "there are more Chinese," followed by Group II and Group III respectively.

Table 5.2 shows that as many as three-fourths of all the Chinese respondents in Group I (74.0%) say among their friends with whom they usually do things or go places are "more" or "lots more" Chinese than Thai people. This proportion is greater than that obtained in Group II, which is a quite high proportion itself (i.e., 50% of the respondents say they have more or lots more Chinese than Thai friends). By contrast, only fifteen per cent of the Chinese in Group III informed us that their friends consist of more Chinese than Thai. From another point of view, about three out of five Chinese in Group III (62%) say they have more Thai than Chinese friends. Only about one out of ten

(12.4%) and less than one out of five (18.3%) respondents in Group I and Group II respectively have more Thai than Chinese friends.

Table 5.2. Proportion of Thai and Chinese Friends

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Lots more Chinese	16.0%	4.7%	.7%
More Chinese	58.0	45.3	15.0
About the same	13.6	31.7	22.3
More Thai	10.7	17.0	48.3
Lots more Thai	1.7	1.3	13.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Again, in Table 5.3 the patterns are repetitive. Group I ranks the highest in number of respondents who say that among their *close* friends "with whom I usually talk about personal affairs, from whom I usually receive help and to whom I usually give help when necessary" are more Chinese or lots more Chinese than Thai people (78.6%). Group II ranks second and Group III third (53.3% and 23.7%) in number of respondents who give these responses. On the other hand, whereas over half of all Chinese in Group III state that they have more Thai than Chinese close friends (43.0%) only 7.7% and 15% of those in Groups I and II, respectively, say so.

Notwithstanding their differential interpersonal association with Thai, the three Chinese groups differ only slightly in their stated "willingness" to associate with Thai if they have an opportunity to do so. All three groups show markedly high proportions of respondents who hold this attitude, but interestingly more Chinese in Group I (82.4%) than in Group II (76.0%) and Group III (77.6%) state such willingness. That is, they would be willing or very willing to have Thai as friends and to do things or go places together with them (see Table 5.4).

However, the majority of the Chinese respondents in each of the three groups who say they would be willing or very willing

Table 5.3. Proportion of Thai and Chinese Close Friends

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Lots more Chinese	23.0%	10.0%	1.7%
More Chinese	55.0	43.3	22.0
About the same	13.7	31.7	23.3
More Thai	7.7	14.0	41.0
Lots more Thai	--	1.0	12.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5.4. Willingness to Befriend and Associate with Thai

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Very willing	31.4%	44.7%	57.3%
Willing	51.0	32.0	20.3
Indifferent	9.3	15.0	.7
Unwilling	3.7	--	.7
Very unwilling	.3	--	1.0
Depends on who they are individually	4.3	8.3	20.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

to associate with Thai also qualify their statements by saying that the degree of intimacy they would allow Thai would depend on individual Thai persons (Table 5.5).

Table 5.5. Degree of Intimacy the Respondent Is Willing to Develop in His Relationship with Thai Persons*

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Very intimately (as with close relatives)	13.7%	15.7%	15.3%
Somewhat intimately	25.0	27.7	26.0
Depends on individual persons	43.7	34.3	35.0
Not intimately	--	--	1.3
Not intimately at all	--	--	--
	82.4%	76.7%	77.6%

*This question was asked of respondents who said they were "willing" and "very willing" to associate with Thai as reported in Table 5.4 only. Cf. question 32 in Appendix I.

Summary and Discussion

As another measure of the relative amount of Chinese-Thai interaction/assimilation, the respondent's actual daily contacts as well as his more intimate or more sustaining relation or association with Thai provide an effective device. Also, the respondent's express attitude toward friendship with Thai or Thai friends proves to be a reliable indicator of his inclination (or lack of inclination) toward Thainess in his social intercourse. Our interview returns show that more Chinese in Group III come into daily contact with more Thai than their counterparts in Group I and Group II. The respondents in Group III also claim more Thai acquaintances and close friends. When Group I and Group II are compared, we find that the latter has slightly more daily contacts with Thai people and has more Thai acquaintances and close friends than the former. However, the

majority of the Chinese in *all* three groups express willingness to associate themselves with Thai and accept Thai as close friends if there is an opportunity for them to do so. The disparity between the attitude and actual behavior of the Chinese in Group I and Group II seems to indicate lack of real opportunity for some Chinese to have closer interpersonal association with Thai than they now have, even though they might not lack the motivation to "take Thai as close friends."

CHAPTER VI

FAMILY AND INTERMARRIAGE AND DIFFERENTIAL ASSIMILATION

Family relations and intermarriage require little explanation as to their importance and validity as a measure of social assimilation. For it is perhaps only in this area of social interaction that, if it takes place in substantial volume and with few or no real barriers, one can say true social assimilation has occurred. From our findings, this, too, is a channel of Chinese-Thai social intercourse through which Chinese are differentially integrated/assimilated into Thai society.

Over two-thirds of the Chinese in Group III state that they have Thai members in their households (63.7%), as compared to less than half of those in Group II (44.3%) and less than a third in Group I (30.3%) who say the same (see Table 6.1)t. In each group, the individuals considered by the respondent as Thai members of his household include the respondent's own spouse and close relatives on either the husband's or wife's side (such as brothers/sisters-in-law, parents-in-law and nieces and nephews)t. In addition, there are reported in all groups Thai employees or servants who are also regarded as members of the household. (Note: while servants are paid domestic helpers, not all employees are servants, i.e., some may be hired to help in a Chinese family's commercial or other business rather than to work directly in the household).

Table 6.1. Per Cent Who Have Thai Members in Same Household*

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Yes	30.3%	44.3%	63.7%
No	69.7	55.7	36.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Here and elsewhere in this chapter, as in the foregoing one, it should be remembered that when the respondent is asked about Thai or Chinese people he is free to make his own judgment as to whom he considers as Thai or Chineset

Nearly two out of three Chinese in Group III (64.7%) report that either they themselves or some of their close relatives (such as their own children or brothers/sisters) are married to Thai persons. In comparison, two out of five of those in Group II (39.7%) and slightly less than one out of five of those in Group I (24%) say the same (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2. Are You or Any of Your Children or Brothers/Sisters Married to a Thai?

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Yes	24.0%	39.7%	64.7%
No	76.0	60.3	35.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The styles of wedding or wedding ceremonies held by the respondents or their relatives who have been married to Thai persons indicate considerable acculturation of Chinese and Thai customs. Of the weddings reported in all three groups, only less than five per cent are described as "purely Chinese" weddings. But the majority of the weddings reported in Group II and next to most of the weddings reported in Group III and Group I are described as "*mixed* Chinese and Thai" weddings. As in several other aspects of their "Thainess," the majority of the Chinese in Group III who say that either they or their close relatives have married Thai persons also describe their or their relatives' weddings as "purely Thai" (see Table 6.3).

When asked to specify criteria of marital choice or preference *in an imaginary situation* in which the respondent was to choose a marriage partner, approximately two-thirds of the Chinese in Group I (65.7%) and slightly over one-third in Group II (36.7%), compared to only a little more than one twentieth in Group III (6.7%) state that their marriage partners *must be Chinese* persons. On the contrary, while only less than five per cent of the Chinese in Groups I and II say that they must marry *Thai* persons, thirteen per cent of their counterparts in Group III say they would prefer Thai to Chinese spouses.

A clear majority of the Chinese in Group III (four in every five) would not object to marrying either a Thai or a Chinese

Table 6.3. Styles of Wedding Held by the Respondent or His Relatives Who Have Been Married to Thai Persons

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Purely Chinese	3.7%	4.7%	2.0%
Mixed Chinese and Thai	7.0	23.3	21.7
Purely Thai	11.3	11.7	39.0
Other	2.0	--	2.0
	24.0%	39.7%	64.7%

person, because to them other factors hold greater importance. Among the other important factors are "love" (named by 62.7% of the respondents), "compatibility in the education background" (concern of about half of the respondents), and "approval of parents" (pointed out as a factor by approximately one out of every three respondents). Two other criteria mentioned by about the same number of Chinese in Group III (about one-fifth of the respondents) are "economic status" and "physical appearance."

Although, as already mentioned, only less than five per cent of the Chinese in Group I and Group II say that they would prefer Thai persons as marriage partners, as many as three out of five in Group II (59%) and about one-third in Group I (32.3%) say they would have preference neither for Chinese nor Thai persons. In other words, they would consider marrying someone according to the criteria other than Thai or Chinese ethnicity *per se*.

Almost twice as many Chinese in Group II (49.7%) and Group III (52%) as in Group I (27%) point to the educational background of a person concerned as an important factor in their marital consideration.

Close to half of all the Chinese respondents in Group I and Group II (49.7% and 43% respectively) would take the opinion or the approval of their parents seriously in selecting their marriage partners. Somewhat fewer respondents in Group III (36.7%) would regard this point as important. In spite of the weight they would give to their parents' opinion or advice, however,

about half of the respondents in Group I (47.7%) and three out of five in Group II (60.3%) say that they would have to "love" a person before they would decide to marry her (or him)t As already reported, about three-fifths of the Chinese in Group III (62.7%) also consider love as an important reason in marital decision. About the same number of Chinese in Group I and Group II (14.3% and 16%) would regard "physical appearance" as an important factor in their marriage choice. As for "economic status,t' slightly less than one-fifth of the Chinese respondents in all three groups say they would consider it as a prerequisite (see Table 6.4)t

Table 6.4. Criteria of Marital Selection

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Love*	47.7%	60.3%	62.7%
Looks or physical appearance	14.3	16.0	20.3
Economic status	16t7	16.0	19.7
Educational background	27.0	49.7	52.0
Approval of elderly people (parents)	49.7	43.0	36.7
Must be a Chinese person	65.7	36.7	6.7
Must be a Thai person	2.0	4.3	13.0
Either Chinese or Thai would make no difference	32.3	59.0	80.3
	255.4%	285.0%	291.4%

*The concept of love in Thai and Chinese (*khwaam rák* and *aỳ* respectively) generally covers not only romantic love, but also such meanings as fondness (*chɔ̂ɔb* in Thai, *hâ'* in Teochiu Chinese) and compatibility (*paikandaaj* or *chataatrooŋkan* in Thai)t Therefore, under this item all responses given in these Thai and Chinese words or phrases and those similar to them are tabulatedt A phrase in Thai quite frequently given by respondents which is also tabulated under "love" is "*tɔ̂ɔtŋpenkhon dii*" (must be a good person--good enough for me to love).

When confronted with a specific, probing question "If you were to choose to marry one of two persons who both meet all of your requirements, but one happens to be Thai and the other Chinese, which one would you choose?" an overwhelmingly large number of respondents in Group I and a sizeable number in Group II (over two-thirds and nearly half respectively) disclose that they would choose to marry the person who is *Chinese*. Quite the contrary, only about one out of every seven (14.3%) Chinese respondents in Group III say they would prefer to choose the Chinese to the Thai person as spouse. Nevertheless, while a very small number of respondents in Group I (3.7%) and Group II (7.3%), and a somewhat greater number of those in Group III (19%) say they would prefer to choose the Thai person, it can be noted that nearly half of those in Group II (45.3%) and over one fourth in Group I (28.3%) would see no difference in marrying either the Chinese or the Thai, if they are similar in all other considerations. Over two-thirds of the respondents in Group III (66.7%) would also disregard a person's Chinese or Thai ethnic background as important in choosing a marriage partner (see Table 6.5).

Table 6.5. Choice of Marriage Partner between a Thai and a Chinese, Given the Fact Candidates Are Equally Qualified According to Respondent's Own Criteria

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Chinese	68.0%	47.4%	14.3%
Thai	3.7	7.3	19.0
Either Thai or Chinese would make no difference	28.3	45.3	66.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The statements below represent the reasons given by the Chinese in all three groups why they would prefer to marry a Thai or a Chinese person, or either a Thai or a Chinese person depending upon other criteria than ethnic ones.

I would prefer to marry a Chinese because:

My parents would approve of it and would be more happy with a Chinese in-lawn

A Chinese wife (or husband) would get along better with my parentsn

As a Chinese I would get along more easily with another Chinese person.

As Chinese we would understand our customs better.

Chinese people are more responsible than Thai people.

A Chinese person would fare better in trade and commerce which is my job.

Chinese are more honest people.

Same nationality. (This word is translated from "*châd*" or "*chɯ̈a châd*" in Thai and "*tàŋ jòk náŋ*" in Teochiu Chinese all of which have the connotation of "race" in a broad sense)n

Chinese are more industrious.

Chinese people have "truer" love.

Chinese wives are more obedient.

I want to retain my association with the Chinese; marriage with a Chinese person would help me to do just that.

I would prefer to marry a Thai because:

I live in Thailand (therefore) I should live as a Thai and mingle with the Thai.

I am educated as a Thai; it would be difficult to live with a person not sharing a similar educational experience.

I can't speak Chinese.

Thai women are more graceful and have better manners.

Thai adjust themselves better.

Thai are less selfish.

> Thai don't look down upon Chinese and I feel natural with themn
>
> I don't get along with the Chinese as well as with the Thai.
>
> My family is always closer to the Thai than the Chinese.

I would have no preference because:

> I do not consider the ethnic background of a person to be important at all.
>
> If people love each other, regardless of their differences, they have the right to get married.
>
> Compatibility is more important than anything else.
>
> There are good people and bad people among Chinese as among Thai; I would not mind marrying a good person, and I don't care whether he is Thai or Chinese.

Regardless of their personal preferences, when queried how they would react to their close relatives marrying a Thai, an overwhelming majority of the Chinese respondents in *all* three groups state that they would *not* have objection to it. Whereas about one out of every four respondents in Group I say they would disapprove such marriages, half of the Chinese in this group (49.3%) say they would *feel indifferent* about it. The rest of the respondents in Group I (one-fourth) would approve of it, that is, either completely approve or approve with some reservation.

While just over one-tenth of the respondents in Group II note that they would somewhat disapprove if their close relatives got married to Thai persons, three-fourths of all the respondents in this group (59%) say they would feel indifferent about it. Also, those in Group II who would either "somewhat approve" or "completely approve" of such marriages number about one-third of the entire group (28.7%)n On the other hand, while almost *no Chinese in Group III* (only 2%, that is) say they would disapprove of their close relatives' marriages to Thai persons, one-third of them (32.7%) say they would "somewhat approve" and one-fifth (21.3%) "completely approve" such inter-ethnic marrigages (Table 6.6)n

Table 6.6. If One of Your Children or Sisters/Brothers or Other Close Relatives Is Married to a Thai How Would You Feel About It?

	Group I Less Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group II More Educated Non-Government Employee (N=300)	Group III Government Employee (N=300)
Completely approve	4.0%	5.7%	21.3%
Somewhat approve	20t7	23.0	32.7
Indifferent	49t3	59.0	44.0
Somewhat disapprove	25.7	11.3	2.0
Completely disapprove	.3	1.0	--
	100.0%	100t0%	100t0%

Summary and Discussion

The attitude and actual behavior of the three Chinese groups concerning intermarriage between Chinese and Thai manifest certain regular patterns and are largely consistent with the findings on other aspects of Chinese-Thai interrelations reported in previous chapterst Group III stands out prominently as a group with favorable attitude toward intermarriage. It also reports the greatest frequency of intermarriages that have already taken place between the members of this group (and/or their close relatives) and Thai persons. Moreover, Group III ranks top in number of Thai considered as members of the respondent's household, which is perhaps largely a consequence of intermarriaget

In many respects, Group II is intermediate between Group III and Group I in its Thainess and Chineseness. Group I is most Chinese in both its attitude and actual behavior concerning intermarriage and stands on the opposite pole on the scale of Chineseness and Thainess to Group III. However, in some important matters, such as in the choice of a marriage partner, Group II shares more in common with Group I, for instance, more respondents in Group II and Group I than in Group III say they would prefer to marry a Chinese person to a Thai persont On the other hand, while a large number of respondents in Group II share with those in Group I the commitment to consider their

parents' approval seriously in choosing a marriage partner, only about half as many in Group I as in Group II would be concerned about the educational background of the person whom they would decide to marry. About the same number of respondents in Group II and Group III (approximately half in each) would similarly consider the educational factor as important.

CHAPTER VII

EVALUATION

The research findings reported in the preceding five chapters confirm most of the original hypotheses and assumptions laid down at the beginning of this study. First of all, the unidimensional criterion of language, presupposed to be the single reliable criterion whereby the Chinese people in Bangkok *as a whole* can be distinguished from the Thai people, proved to be completely effectivet The validity of the working definition of a Chinese person, i.e., as "a person born and raised within a family in which both parents are native speakers of Chinese" is confirmed by the data showing that practically every respondent in each group knows how to speak Chinese. Furthermore, the three Chinese groups, as distinguished from one another according to pre-specified sociological variables which served as the basis of our quota sampling, have shown differential social interaction and integration/assimilation with Thai in essentially all areas of their social intercourse. To briefly reidentify these differentiating variables, Group I is the group of Chinese people who are: (1) less educated in the Thai educational system, (2) older, and (3) have higher income than the Chinese people in Group II. Nevertheless, Group I and Group II are completely (numerically) the same in: (1) sex ratio, (2) parents' native Chinese dialects, (3) religious affiliation, and (4) residential location. Thus the identical frequency distribution of the Chinese with various social characteristics in Group I and Group II constituted the variables which we were able to control. Group III is not exactly identical with either Group I or Group II in any particular social characteristic but it is very largely identical with both of these groups in religious affiliation and residential location. In educational attainment, despite the nearly one-fourth of the respondents who have had less than seven years of Thai schooling, none in Group III is illiterate, that is, none is without any formal schooling in the Thai language. In this regard, therefore, Group III is more closely similar to Group II than Group I. However, Group III is totally differentiated from both Group I and Group II in occupational affiliation, which means all Chinese respondents in Group III are employed in Thai government agencies whereas none in either Group I or Group II ist In occupational affiliation, it can also be said that although no conscious control was planned, the majority of the Chinese respondents in Group II are salaried employees in private business organizations, i.e., those ranging from business executives and managers to white collar workers and janitors in banks and companies, etc. At the same time the majority of the Chinese respondents in Group I

can be said to be *independent* private entrepreneurs running their own businesses ranging from small-scale retail stores to larger import-export firms, manufacturing firms, service industries, and others. These occupational characteristics are clearly evident in our interview returns. Hence, in addition to the differentiating factor of occupational strata based on income levels, the three Chinese groups are also differentiated from each other in the types of occupation with which they are affiliated, which forms another independent variable in our analysis.

Concomitant to the above differentiated social characteristics, Group I is found to be most Chinese and least Thai in their attitude and actual behavior in all areas of their social existence and interaction and Group III least Chinese and most Thai of the three groups. Compared to Group I and Group III, Group II is intermediate in its Thainess and Chineseness, but in some areas it is more closely identifiable with Group I and in others with Group III the details of which have been fully reported.

The overwhelming influence of the Teochiu dialect among the Chinese in Bangkok and Thonburi is evidenced by the empirical fact that on a percentage basis Teochiu was learned by the majority of the respondents in all three groups including those whose parents' native dialect was not Teochiu. This influence stems from the large size of the Teochiu population as well as the acknowledged value of this dialect in the trading and commercial activity of the Chinese people. If a Chinese person's ability to speak a Chinese dialect other than his own could be considered as an indication of his attachment to the Chinese community, then, obviously Group I is the most strongly and Group III the least strongly attached to the Chinese community, with Group II intermediate between them.

On education, perhaps due to their common educational experience in the Thai system, Group II and Group III share a similarly favorable attitude toward the value of education (namely, Thai education), but both differ noticeably from Group I. Therefore, with respect to this particular social attitude, the Chinese in Group II and Group III can be said to have been similarly integrated/assimilated into the value of Thai education, but those in Group I have not. Yet, similar to Group II and Group III, a large number of respondents in Group I also have their close relatives (i.e., children or brothers/sisters) attending Thai schools. But this fact should not be interpreted as an incongruity in the attitude and actual behavior of the Chinese respondents in Group I for a passive attitude toward education does not necessarily mean readiness or willingness to prevent others from acquiring it. If a Thai education can be regarded as an avenue to greater social integration/assimila-

tion one can reasonably predict that, in spite of a negative attitude toward integration/assimilation detected in Group I, as increasing numbers of Chinese in all three groups (or their younger generation) continue to attend Thai schools the overall trend of Chinese-Thai assimilation through education is likely to increase.

The differences in occupational affiliation of the three Chinese groups seem to be a major factor underlying their different occupational preferences and the different preferences which they express on behalf of their younger generation. Although the Chinese in Group I have a more definite idea about the occupation or occupations which they would prefer to see their younger relatives enter (i.e., the largest majority would prefer trade and commerce), it is discernible that those in Group III are more inclined toward government occupation and those in Group II toward salaried positions in private business firms. Hence, if government service can be construed as a Thai occupation it seems clear that the Chinese in Group III have been integrated/assimilated into Thai society not only in their overt (behavioral) occupational affiliation but also in their subjective attitude (as judged from their occupational preference). Likewise, if trade and commerce can be viewed as a *Chinese occupation* (as it is done by a large number of respondents), it can be concluded that the Chinese in Group I are not integrated/assimilated into Thai society in this respect. Not only is Group I composed mainly of people who are actively engaged in trade and commerce, but the majority of them express a desire to see their younger relatives inherit this occupation and shun other occupations which they consider as primarily Thai occupations, especially government service.

Objectively, the occupational division of labor by ethnic groups is true only to an extent. It is necessarily arbitrary because even in occupations considered as essentially "Thai" such as government service one finds Chinese personnel or personnel of Chinese origin; vice versa, in occupations considered as essentially "Chinese" such as trade and commerce one also finds Thai in large number. However, a significant number of our respondents (particularly Group I) do affirmatively refer to some occupations as Thai and others as Chinese. Moreover, a notable number of those who believe in such ethnic division of occupations also display their inclination to cling to one or another occupation for ethnic reasons. It is in view of these research responses that we decided to treat occupational preference as a measure of Chinese-Thai social integration/assimilation.

On the basis of occupational preference, Chinese respondents in Group II are less inclined than their counterparts in Group III to support any tendency of their younger relatives, now or

in the future, to enter the government service and are also less inclined than their fellow Chinese in Group I to help their younger family members to run their own, independent (perhaps relatively small-scale) business enterprises. The occupation most favored by the respondents in Group II is "employment in a private business organization." Interestingly this particular category of employment is labeled neither "Thai" nor "Chinese," even though a conspicuous number of modern business enterprises such as banks, construction firms, and trading companies are owned and operated by Chinese. Perhaps because the operation of these modern enterprises in its formal and informal aspects (not unlike the operation of many Western-owned enterprises with offices in Bangkok and Thonburi) requires the service of personnel with a certain level of Thai education, this category of employment is not viewed in terms of monopoly by a particular ethnic group. Employment in such a situation seems to provide a special opportunity for social interaction between Chinese people educated in the Thai system and their Thai colleaguest Whereas the government office, such as that occupied by the Chinese respondents in Group III, is "typically Thai" and the Chinese in Group III themselves seem oriented toward traditional Thai bureaucratic values of power and hierarchical status, the business organization seems to present a more "modern" atmosphere of greater equality and rationality. The study of the latter type of organization, either with respect to social assimilation or something else, must be done in a broad context of social change in Thailand. Although social (organizational) change is not the problem of our direct concern in this study, we are able to point out from our data that the structure of the new, modern private business organization in urban Thailand bears importantly upon Chinese-Thai social interaction and integration/assimilation. Our research findings demonstrate that the "transitional" or "intermediate" character in the attitude and behavior of the Chinese in Group II are in a genuine way conditioned by their affiliation with private business organizations.

Only on a few matters are the Chinese in all three groups in agreement with one anothert One such matter is the belief that Chinese are superior to Thai as merchants, hence, Chinese should continue operating as merchants in Thailand. Although this consensus might seem contradictory to the view of a large majority of respondents in Group II and Group III about the occupations they wish to see their younger relatives pursue (i.e., not predominantly trade and commerce), the divergent views concerning occupational choice as it involves the respondentts *own* family might indicate real social identification of the respondents in Group II and Group III. That is, while Chinese are considered to be the best merchants in Thailand, those Chinese who have adopted Thai values and life style as well as those who are in the process of transition or assimilation into

Thai society may not think of themselves and their families as true or potential merchants. As more than half of the respondents in Group I and Group II predict that trade and commerce in Thailand will always remain occupied by Chinese, it can probably be understood that to these respondents the meaning of a "Chinese occupation" is such that once one leaves it (e.g., to enter a "Thai occupation") one is bound to lose his Chineseness or Chinese identity. Here there seems to be room for much further research on the Chinese who have become educated in the Thai system (particularly at higher levels) but, nonetheless, remain in or return to essentially "Chinese occupations" such as trade and commerce. In this study it has been found that a number of Chinese graduates of Thai universities have returned to their parents' businesses and operated as "Chinese merchants." Their image among Chinese and Thai people alike seems to be that they are Chinese for, in spite of their Thai educational background, they tend to fall back to the Chinese community due to their (Chinese) occupational affiliation. As a suggestion for further research, it would seem worthwhile to investigate the impact of Thai educational experience upon the "educated Chinese merchants" as well as upon any change in the "Chinese occupation" to which they are affiliated. It seems reasonable to presume that these educated merchants may in the long run serve as pioneers to bring change to the ethnic status of trade and commerce. Similarly the growing role of Thai in trade and commerce deserves due attention.

Group I contributes the largest number of Chinese people who view Thai as fitted for government employment and, hence, as people who should not involve themselves in a predominantly Chinese occupation such as trade and commerce. This prejudicial attitude can perhaps be understood as a Chinese safeguard against their seeming ethnic monopoly of business careers in Thailand. It is interesting to note that such an attitude is most widely held by the Chinese most distant from Thai society who are also mostly non-Thai citizens legally barred from most government positions. The "reasons" given by those who suggest that Thai should work for their government and stay away from business activity include: (1) Thai are eligible for government jobs, Chinese aren't; (2) Thai are *not* qualified to do other jobs, especially trade and commerce; (3) Thai have the necessary connection with people in the government bureaucracy, Chinese usually do not. But in spite of these "reasons," as a number of respondents in all three groups state that if they had an opportunity they would prefer business as their career for the sake of better income, it would seem that a further inquiry into this economically relevant attitude among "pure" Thai people as compared with Thai people of Chinese descent would be of great value.

The regularity in the patterns of differential social integration/assimilation is further evidenced by the differential

adherence to, or conformity with, Chinese and Thai traditional religious values and customs. Although a sizeable number of Chinese respondents in all three groups overtly conform to the expectations of Chinese religion, those in Group I are the most conformist of all. In Group I we find that as many as nine out of ten respondents adhere to and practice the Chinese cult of filial piety. On the contrary, a significantly larger number of the Chinese in Group III than in the other two groups worship in the Thai Buddhist monastery (*wat*) and present alms to Thai Buddhist priests. Group III also ranks far above the other two groups in number of respondents who believe that entrance into the Buddhist priesthood is a way to pay the moral debt to one's parents. (Note: filial piety and entrance into the Buddhist priesthood differ from each other not only in their ritual, but in philosophical purposes and subjective meaning to the actor as well). The findings that there are more Chinese in Group III than in Group II, and more in Group II than in Group I, who have been in the Buddhist priesthood is further positive empirical evidence showing the differential social integration/assimilation of the three Chinese groups into Thai society through religious belief and practice.

Two other aspects of social (interpersonal) interaction between the Chinese and the Thai in Bangkok and Thonburi investigated were friendship and intermarriage. As in other areas of interaction reported and analyzed earlier, the patterns of differential social interaction and, concomitantly, social integration/assimilation remain consistent. For example, Group III has the largest number of Chinese people whose daily contacts are *Thai*, followed by Group II and Group I in that order. Also Group III, compared with Group II and Group I respectively, is the group in which most of the Chinese respondents have friends or close friends who are *Thai*. Thus, just as in most other areas of social interaction, Group II is also intermediate between Group I and Group III in its Thainess or amount of social integration/assimilation as judged by the extent of daily face-to-face interaction as well as the existence of friendship with Thai.

In intermarriage and family relations the patterns of differential social interaction and integration/assimilation are equally consistent. Group I is most Chinese and least Thai (i.e., least integrated/assimilated) while Group III is most Thai and least Chinese and Group II falls in between them. These consistent patterns are evident in practically every aspect of family relations and intermarriage ranging from the presence or absence of Thai members in the respondent's household, the existence of intermarriage between the respondent or one of his close relatives and a Thai person, the wedding style and the attitude toward intermarriage.

Hence, throughout this report, wherever we were able to provide empirical evidence of the *different proportions* or *different amounts of interaction* between Chinese in each of the three groups investigated and the Thai people (or society and culture), we referred to this as "differential social interaction" as well as "differential social integration *and/or* assimilation." On the basis of the empirical data presented, there can be no question as to the reality of the phenomenon of differential Chinese-Thai interaction. Yet, the terms "social integration" and "social assimilation" warrant some clarification. We recognize that not every social interaction, whether at the institutional or the interpersonal level, entails or is accompanied by social integration, particularly if integration is taken to mean "harmony." No doubt, human interaction occurs even in a conflict and disintegrating situation. In the present study, since the areas of social interaction dealt with are those in which interaction can take place only under conditions of minimum social integration, we are able to treat interaction conveniently as a measure of social integration. For example, in intermarriage and family relations, inasmuch as we know Chinese in each of the three groups intermarry with Thai in different percentages, we are able to conclude that their differential interaction through intermarriage is also indicative of their differential social integration. Similarly the Chinese who interact differentially with Thai in their occupations can be regarded as differentially integrated in that respect and those who report differential interaction through religion can also be considered as differentially integrated in religious values and behavior. In the present research, then, in so far as we have been able to determine a differential interaction of the Chinese and the Thai in each of the social or cultural areas treated, we can conclude that there is concomitantly a differential social integration of the three different Chinese groups investigated. In addition, since in the present study we have assumed close relationships between social integration and social assimilation and have consistently referred to the former concept in the "and/or" context of the latter, we are able to conclude that in most or all areas of their interaction and integration with Thai society the three Chinese groups are also differentially assimilated to their host society.

According to Robert E. Park, social assimilation is "the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a national existence."[1] By this broad and old but original and adequate sociological definition, our data on the urban Chinese

---

1. "Assimilation, Social," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. II (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1930), p. 281.

Thai case clearly testify to differential social assimilation. Although the indicators of social assimilation used vary from casual interpersonal contacts to adoption of religious values and practices and intermarriages, it is clear that by *all* of our indicators the patterns of social assimilation show marked consistency, that is, the proportions (and degrees) of Chinese social assimilation range from the lowest in Group I to the highest in Group III. Thus, whereas Chinese-Thai interaction may have produced a cultural solidarity "sufficient to sustain a national existence" and "social intermixing," it is clear that some Chinese people have a greater share in such a state of affairs than others. And indeed, as our findings have shown, there are those who have little or no share in it at all, especially those in Group I.

There can be no doubt that whenever there is social assimilation there is also social integration. But because both of these terms connote a broad spectrum of phenomena, some of which may differ widely (e.g., in the degree of social intimacy), it does not necessarily follow that social integration always entails social assimilation. For example, Park cites the case of an alien who may *accommodate* himself to the conditions of life in a foreign country without learning the native language and without adopting, except to a very slight degree, the native customs. In that case, according to Park, the relation of the alien to the native is merely "symbiotic," not "social."[2] In such a case there can hardly be any social assimilation, though there may be "integration," especially if social integration is taken in a broad sense to mean an absence of significant social conflict. In the present study our empirical data have confirmed that in each Chinese group investigated some Chinese-Thai social integration exists in all areas of their cultural and social coexistence, but such social integration varies in both proportion of integrated people and degree of their intimacy with the host society. To the extent that in each and every area of interaction treated Chinese-Thai interaction evinces a *social* and not merely symbiotic relation, we can conclude that the Chinese-Thai differential social integration reported also signifies differential social assimilation.

Although on the basis of the data we were able to obtain under the existing circumstances we would not venture to present a conclusive causal explanation of Chinese-Thai social assimilation, the following general observation may be of some comparative and theoretical value. Observing intergroup relations in America half a century ago, Park noted, ". . . in America, the chief obstacle to assimilation seems to be not cultural differences but physical traits. It is notorious that Japanese,

---

2. *Ibid.*

Chinese and any other immigrant peoples who bear a distinctive racial mark do not easily mix with the native populations. The Negro, during his three hundred years in this country, has not been assimilated. This is not because he has preserved in America a foreign culture and an alien tradition. . . . To say that the Negro is not assimilated *means no more than to say that he is still regarded as in some sense a stranger, a representative of an alien race*. This distinction which sets him apart from the rest of the population is real, but it is based not upon cultural traits but upon *cultural and racial* characteristics."[3] This observation holds true even today, even as change has taken place in many areas of American social life.

But quite different from the reality of the American scene, physical traits are not the chief obstacle to social assimilation in Thailand. As noted in Chapter I, the difficulty in defining the Chinese in Thailand resulted largely from their similarity in physical appearance to Thai. Therefore, to say that some Chinese are not assimilated has to mean something other than to say they are regarded in some sense (only) as strangers or as representatives of an alien *race*. It means that they are regarded as culturally and socially Chinese, not Thai. Of course, this is meant in no way to suggest that in Thailand (both among Thai and Chinese) stereotypes about Chinese and Thai "racial difference" are not prevalent. It implies, rather, that it is not uncommon to hear verbal remarks which evidence the confusion in the physical identity of both the Chinese and the Thai such as "This Chinese looks Thai," and "That Thai looks Chinese."

Therefore, while recognizing the difference in physical traits as a major obstacle to social assimilation, we have learned in the course of this study that the social associations and interactions which have erased the external signs of race and even nationality *cannot* be assumed to have automatically modified the fundamental cultural *and* social characteristics. In Southeast Asia it is not only the Thai who bear physical resemblance to Chinese people. The Malays, the Filipinos, the Indonesians and others are no less similar in their physical traits to the Chinese (and other Asian peoples) than the Thai. However, the patterns and extent of social assimilation of the Overseas Chinese to indigenous populations in Southeast Asia *largely* vary from country to country. In urban Thailand, as we have shown in this study, while there is no major obstacle due to notorious differences in physical traits, more Chinese in one group than in another are assimilated. Similarly the proportion of those assimilated to those still not assimilated *in each of the many areas of cultural and social interaction* that

---

3. *Ibidi* Italics supplied.

exist also varies from group to groupt It is evident that there are grades and degrees of assimilation, and we have investigated them by various means. We have measured *external* uniformities of Thai and Chinese "manners" or behavior as manifested in the respondent's speech, occupationţ educationţ religion, and marriage and the familyt We have also measured the extent to which the Chinese in each group have adopted to their *subjective frame of reference* (i.e., their attitude) the Thai language, Thai customs and institutionst To the extent that our attempt to gauge these phenomena has yielded some success, the present study ought to shed some light on the nature and dimensions of the problem dealt witht

APPENDIX I

Class Composition of the Sample (based on occupational stratum and/or income average officially associated with it):

	Income Level*	Examples of Job Categories**
I	Uncertain or undetermined	Student, non-earning housewife, retiree and employed person whose income is uncertain due to the temporary or part-time character of his employment
II	Above ฿2,500 per month	Special grade and first grade official, professional, manager and proprietor of large business
III	฿1,201-2,500 per month	Second grade official, assistant-manager, junior executive, proprietor of medium-size business
IV	฿701-1,200 per month	Third grade official, non-clerical office worker, small retail shop keeper, school teacher, free-lance (non-proprietor) businessman
V	฿401-700 per month	Fourth grade official, clerical, skilled worker
VI	Up to ฿400	Unskilled laborer

---

* Income levels are only rough (and very conservative) estimates and are quite arbitrarily divided from each other. They are drawn up largely to serve as guidelines to the distinctions of various occupational statusest In assigning the respondent to a particular class, we actually put greater emphasis upon his occupational rank or position relative to that of other respondents than upon his estimated income or property.

** Based partly on information contained in *Population Census of Thailand: B.E. 2503* (Bangkok and Thonburi).

Residential Location of the Respondent*

Zone 1: North Bangkok
PhraNakorn, Pomprab, Dusit, Bangkapi, Bangkhen districts

Zone 2: South Bangkok
Sampanthawong, Bangrak, Yannawa, Phrakhanong, Pathumwan districts

Zone 3: Thonburi
Thonburi, Bangkokyai, Bangkoknoi, Klongsan districts

---

*Districts outside of the jurisdiction of the municipalities of Bangkok and Thonburi are excluded from the sample.

Interview Schedule

แบบสัมภาษณ์ในการศึกษาเรื่องความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคนจีนและคนไทยในพระนคร - ธนบุรี ของมหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์

รายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์

ก. เพศ

.....ชาย

.....หญิง

ข. อายุ

.....๑๕ - ๒๔ ปี

.....๒๕ - ๓๔ ปี

.....๓๕ - ๔๔ ปี

.....๔๕ - ๕๔ ปี

.....๕๕ ปีขึ้นไป

ค. ที่เกิด

.....พระนคร - ธนบุรี

.....ต่างจังหวัด

.....เมืองจีน

.....ที่อื่น (ระบุ)

ฆ. (ถ้าไม่ได้เกิดในพระนคร - ธนบุรี แล้วอพยพเข้ามาอยู่ในพระนคร - ธนบุรี)

เวลาที่อยู่ในพระนคร - ธนบุรี

.....ปี

(ถ้าเกิดเมืองจีนหรือที่อื่น แต่ไม่ใช่เมืองไทย แล้วอพยพเข้ามาอยู่ในเมืองไทย)

.....ปี

ง. การศึกษา

ในเมืองไทย	ในเมืองจีน	ที่อื่น (ระบุ)	
.....	.....	.....	๗ปีหรือต่ำกว่า
.....	.....	.....	๘ - ๑๐ ปี
.....	.....	.....	๑๑ - ๑๒ ปี
.....	.....	.....	สูงกว่า ๑๒ ปี
.....	.....	.....	ไม่เคยเรียนในโรงเรียน

จ. ภาษาดั้งเดิมของบิดาและมารดา

บิดา	มารดา
.....	..... แต้จิ๋ว
.....	..... แคะ
.....	..... ไหหลำ
.....	..... กวางตุ้ง
.....	..... ฮกเกี้ยน
.....	..... ไทย
.....	..... อื่นๆ (ระบุ)

ฉ. กลุ่มภาษาจีน

.....	แต้จิ๋ว
.....	แคะ
.....	ไหหลำ
.....	กวางตุ้ง
.....	ฮกเกี้ยน

ช. ศาสนา

.....	พุทธ หรือขงจื๊อ
.....	คริสเตียน

ฌ. ระดับอาชีพ (ผู้สัมภาษณ์โปรดถามรายละเอียด แล้วเขียนคำอธิบายในช่องของแต่ละระดับที่กำหนดไว้ โดยดูคู่มือประกอบ)

..... ๑

. . . . . ๒

. . . . . ๓

. . . . . ๔

. . . . . ๕

. . . . . ๖

ฌ. เขตสัมภาษณ์

. . . . . ๑

. . . . . ๒

. . . . . ๓

. . . . . ๔

ญ. กลุ่มสัมภาษณ์

. . . . . ๑

. . . . . ๒

. . . . . ๓

๑. คุณพูดภาษาอะไรได้บ้าง

. . . . . แต้จิ๋ว

. . . . . แคะ

. . . . . ไหหลำ

. . . . . กวางตุ้ง

. . . . . ฮกเกี้ยน

. . . . . ไทย

. . . . . อื่นๆ (ระบุ)

๒. คุณพูดภาษาอะไรเป็นภาษาแรก

. . . . . แต้จิ๋ว

. . . . . แคะ

. . . . . ไหหลำ

. . . . . กวางตุ้ง

..... ฮกเกี้ยน

..... ไทย

..... อื่นๆ (ระบุ)

๓. สามี ภรรยา พี่ น้อง หรือญาติสนิทที่อยู่บ้านเดียวกับคุณพูดภาษาอะไรได้บ้าง

..... แต้จิ๋ว

..... แคะ

..... ไหหลำ

..... กวางตุ้ง

..... ฮกเกี้ยน

..... ไทย

..... อื่นๆ (ระบุ)

๔. ในการดำรงชีวิตประจำวันภายในบ้านของคุณ คุณพูดภาษาจีนหรือภาษาไทยมากกว่ากัน

..... จีนแทบทั้งหมดหรือทั้งหมด

..... จีนส่วนมาก

..... จีนและไทยพอๆกัน

..... ไทยส่วนมาก

..... ไทยแทบทั้งหมดหรือทั้งหมด

๕. ในการดำรงชีวิตประจำวันนอกบ้านของคุณ คุณพูดภาษาจีนหรือภาษาไทยมากกว่ากัน

..... จีนแทบทั้งหมดหรือทั้งหมด

..... จีนส่วนมาก

..... จีนและไทยพอๆกัน

..... ไทยส่วนมาก

..... ไทยแทบทั้งหมดหรือทั้งหมด

๖. ท่านเห็นว่าในการใช้ชีวิตประจำวันของท่าน ท่านมีความจำเป็นต้องใช้

ภาษาจีนมากน้อยแค่ไหน

..... จำเป็นมากที่สุด

..... จำเป็นพอสมควร

..... จำเป็นพอๆกับภาษาไทย

..... ไม่สู้จำเป็นเท่าไรนัก

..... ไม่จำเป็นเลย

๗. ท่านเห็นว่าในการใช้ชีวิตประจำวันของท่าน ท่านมีความจำเป็นต้องใช้ภาษาไทยมากน้อยแค่ไหน

..... จำเป็นมากที่สุด

..... จำเป็นพอสมควร

..... จำเป็นพอๆกับภาษาจีน

..... ไม่สู้จำเป็นเท่าไรนัก

..... ไม่จำเป็นเลย

๘. ท่านเห็นว่าบุตรหลานหรือญาติสนิทของท่านในปัจจุบันทั้งที่เป็นผู้ใหญ่แล้ว และที่กำลังจะโตขึ้นมาเป็นผู้ใหญ่ในอนาคต มีความจำเป็นต้องรู้ภาษาจีนมากน้อยแค่ไหน

..... จำเป็นต้องรู้ที่สุด

..... จำเป็นพอสมควร

..... จำเป็นต้องรู้พอๆกับภาษาไทย

..... ไม่สู้จำเป็นเท่าไรนัก

..... ไม่จำเป็นต้องรู้เลย

๙. เมื่อบุตรหลานหรือญาติสนิทของท่านพูดกับท่านเป็นภาษาไทย ท่านมีความรู้สึกอย่างไรต่อเขาบ้าง ขอความกรุณาเล่าตามที่ท่านรู้สึกจริงๆ

.....

.....

.....

๑๐. ท่านมีบุตรธิดา หรือพี่น้องร่วมบิดามารดาที่เรียนหรือเคยเรียนหนังสือในโรงเรียนไทยบ้างไหม

..... มี

..... ไม่มี

๑๐. ก. (ถ้า "มี") ท่านอยากจะเห็นเขาเรียนถึงชั้นไหน

..... ม.๓ หรือ ป.๗

..... ม.๖ หรือ มศ.๓

..... ม.๘ หรือ มศ.๕ หรืออาชีวะ

..... มหาวิทยาลัยหรือเทียบเท่า

๑๑. ท่านมีความเห็นอย่างไรกับคำที่กล่าวว่า "การศึกษาทำให้คนได้ดี หรือการศึกษาเป็นหนทางทำให้คนสามารถเปลี่ยนฐานะของตัวเอง" ขอความกรุณาอธิบายโดยยกตัวอย่างให้ดู

.....

.....

.....

๑๒. ถ้าท่านมีพี่น้องหรือบุตรหลานญาติสนิทในครอบครัวของท่านที่อยากเรียนหนังสือ เพื่อจะได้เป็นข้าราชการ ท่านจะมีความเห็นดีเห็นชอบกับเขาอย่างใดหรือไม่

..... ยินดีสนับสนุนอย่างยิ่ง

..... ยินดีสนับสนุนพอสมควร

..... เฉยๆ ไม่ยินดียินร้าย

..... ไม่ยินดีสนับสนุน

..... ไม่ยินดีสนับสนุนเลย

๑๒. ก. โปรดให้เหตุผลว่า ทำไมท่านจึงมีความเห็นอย่างนั้น

.....

.....

.....

๑๓. ท่านไหว้เจ้าหรือไหว้บรรพบุรุษหรือเปล่า

..... ไหว้ทุกวัน

..... ไหว้เดือนละสองครั้ง

..... ไหว้ทุกครั้งขมื่อถึงเทศกาลหรือตรุษสารท

..... ไม่ไหว้เลย

๑๔. ท่านเคยทำบุญตักบาตรไหม

..... บ่อยที่สุด

..... บอยพอสมควร

..... นานๆครั้ง

..... ไม่เคยเลย

๑๕. ท่านเคยทำบุญโดยการบริจาคทรัพย์ให้แก่วัดไทยในศาสนาพุทธ เช่นทอดกฐิน ทอดผ้าป่า สมทบทุนสร้าง-ซ่อมวัด และอื่นๆบ้างไหม

..... บริจาคบ่อยที่สุด

..... บริจาคบ่อยพอสมควร

..... นานๆบริจาคครั้งหนึ่ง

..... ไม่เคยบริจาคเลย

(ถ้าผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์เป็นคริสเตียนหรือคริสตังไม่ต้องถามข้อ ๑๖)

๑๖. มีความเชื่อกันว่า การบวชเป็นวิธีการทดแทนบุญคุณบิดามารดาอย่างหนึ่ง ท่านมีความเห็นอย่างไร

..... เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

..... เห็นด้วยพอสมควร

..... เฉยๆ เห็นด้วยก็ไม่ใช่ ไม่เห็นด้วยก็ไม่เชิง

..... ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย

..... ไม่เห็นด้วยเลย

(ถ้าผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์เป็นผู้หญิงหรือคริสเตียน คริสตัง ไม่ต้องถามข้อ ๑๗ และ ๑๘)

๑๗. ตัวท่านเองหรือญาติสนิทของท่านในครอบครัวเดียวกันเคยมีใครบวชเป็นพระภิกษุในพุทธศาสนาบ้างไหม

..... เคย

..... ไม่เคย

๑๘. ถ้าท่านมีโอกาสบวช ท่านอยากจะบวชไหม

..... อยาก

..... ไม่อยาก

๑๘. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าท่านมีเหตุผลอย่างไร

.....

.....

.....

๑๙. ถ้าบุตรหลาน พี่น้อง ญาติสนิทในครอบครัวของท่านมีโอกาสบวช ท่านอยากจะเห็นเขาบวชไหม

..... อยากเห็น

..... ไม่อยากเห็น

๑๙. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าท่านมีเหตุผลอย่างไร

.....

.....

.....

๒๐. การทำบุญกุศลมีหลายวิธี บางคนก็ไหว้เจ้าในศาลเจ้า บางคนก็ไหว้พระในวัด แต่บางคนก็ไหว้ทั้งสองอย่าง ทำบุญทั้งสองวิธี ท่านว่าทำบุญอย่างไหนดีและถูกต้อง

.....

.....

.....

๒๑. ท่านมีความเห็นเกี่ยวกับการประกอบพิธีศพอย่างไร บางคนก็ทำฮวงซุ้ยเป็นการถูกต้องตามประเพณี ทำให้ผู้ตายได้รับประโยชน์ แต่บางคนก็ว่าการฌาปนกิจเป็นการประหยัดและสะดวกดี ขอความกรุณาอธิบายตามความเห็นของท่าน

.....

.....

.....

๒๒. เมื่อคนในครอบครัวของท่านถึงแก่กรรม ตามปกติครอบครัวของท่านทำพิธีศพแบบไหน

..... จีนล้วน

..... จีนปนไทย

..... ไทยล้วน

..... อื่นๆ (โปรดอธิบาย)

๒๓. ถ้าท่านมีโอกาสเลือกประกอบอาชีพได้ตามใจชอบ ท่านคิดว่าท่านจะเลือกอาชีพอะไร

..... ก. งานช่าง, วิศวกรรม, สถาปัตย์

..... ข. แพทย์

..... ค. ครู, อาจารย์

..... ง. ค้าขาย

..... จ. ทหาร

..... ฉ ตำรวจ

..... ช. ราชการพลเรือน

..... ซ. งานบริษัทห้างร้าน

..... ฮ. อื่นๆ (โปรดระบุ)

๒๓. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมท่านจึงคิดว่าจะเลือกประกอบอาชีพนั้น

.....

.....

๒๔. ถ้าท่านมีพี่น้องบุตรหลานญาติสนิทในครอบครัวเดียวกัน ท่านอยากจะเห็นเขาประกอบอาชีพทางไหน

..... ก. งานช่าง, วิศวกรรม, สถาปัตย์

..... ข. แพทย์

..... ค. ครู, อาจารย์

..... ง. ค้าขาย

..... จ. ทหาร

..... ฉ. ตำรวจ

..... ช. ราชการพลเรือน

..... ซ. งานบริษัทห้างร้าน

..... ฌ. อื่นๆ (โปรดระบุ)

๒๔. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมท่านจึงอยากให้เขาประกอบอาชีพนั้น

.....

.....

.....

๒๕ ท่านมีความรู้สึกอย่างไรกับคำกล่าวที่ว่า "อาชีพค้าขายในเมืองไทยจะต้องเป็นอาชีพของคนจีนอยู่ตลอดไป"

..... เห็นด้วยอย่างมาก

..... เห็นด้วยอยู่บ้าง

..... เฉยๆ จะว่าเห็นด้วยก็ไม่ใช่ ไม่เห็นด้วยก็ไม่เชิง

..... ไม่ใคร่เห็นด้วย

..... ไม่เห็นด้วยเลย

๒๕. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมท่านจึงรู้สึกหรือคิดเช่นนั้น

.....

.....

.....

๒๖. ท่านเห็นด้วยไหมกับคำกล่าวที่ว่า "อาชีพราชการเป็นอาชีพที่คนไทยผูกขาด และคนจีนไม่มีโอกาสเข้าไปทำเลย"

..... เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
..... เห็นด้วยอยู่บ้าง
..... เฉยๆ จะว่าเห็นด้วยก็ไม่ใช่ ไม่เห็นด้วยก็ไม่เชิง
..... ไม่ใคร่เห็นด้วย
..... ไม่เห็นด้วยเลย

๒๖. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมท่านจึงเห็นอย่างนั้น

.....

.....

.....

๒๗. ท่านเห็นด้วยไหมกับคำกล่าวที่ว่า "คนจีนควรทำอาชีพทางการค้าขาย เพราะถนัดกว่าอาชีพอย่างอื่น"

..... เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
..... เห็นด้วยอยู่บ้าง
..... เฉยๆ จะว่าเห็นด้วยก็ไม่ใช่ ไม่เห็นด้วยก็ไม่เชิง
..... ไม่ใคร่เห็นด้วย
..... ไม่เห็นด้วยเลย

๒๗. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมท่านจึงเห็นอย่างนั้น

.....

.....

.....

๒๘. ท่านเห็นด้วยไหมกับคำกล่าวที่ว่า "คนไทยควรทำราชการ ไม่ควรทำการค้าขาย"

..... เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

..... เห็นด้วยอยู่บ้าง

..... เฉยๆ จะว่าเห็นด้วยก็ไม่ใช่ ไม่เห็นด้วยก็ไม่เชิง

..... ไม่ใคร่เห็นด้วย

..... ไม่เห็นด้วยเลย

๒๘. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมท่านจึงเห็นอย่างนั้น

.....

.....

.....

๒๙. ในชีวิตประจำวันของท่าน ท่านพบปะกับคนจีนหรือคนไทยมากกว่ากัน

..... คนจีนมากกว่ามากนัก

..... คนจีนมากกว่า

..... พอๆกัน

..... คนไทยมากกว่า

..... คนไทยมากกว่ามากนัก

๓๐. ในบรรดาเพื่อนสนิทของท่านที่ท่านมักจะไปไหนมาไหนหรือทำอะไรๆด้วยกันเป็นประจำ มีคนจีนมากกว่าหรือคนไทยมากกว่า

..... คนจีนมากกว่ามากนัก

..... คนจีนมากกว่า

..... พอๆกัน

..... คนไทยมากกว่า

..... คนไทยมากกว่ามากนัก

๓๑. ในบรรดาคนที่ท่านถือว่าเป็นเพื่อนสนิทที่จะปรึกษาหารือเรื่องส่วนตัวทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างได้ และที่ท่านมักจะได้รับความช่วยเหลือเวลามีความจำเป็น มีคนจีนหรือคนไทยมากกว่ากัน

..... คนจีนมากกว่ามากนัก

..... คนจีนมากกว่า

..... พอๆกัน

..... คนไทยมากกว่า

..... คนไทยมากกว่ามากนัก

๓๑. ก. โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมจึงเป็นเช่นนั้น

.....

.....

๓๒. ถ้าท่านมีโอกาสคบค้าสมาคมกับคนไทยฉันท์เพื่อน ทำอะไรๆด้วยกัน หรือไปไหนด้วยกันเสมอ ท่านจะยินดีหรือไม่ยินดีคบกับเขา

..... ยินดีคบค้าด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

..... ไม่รังเกียจที่จะคบค้าด้วย

..... เฉยๆ ไม่ยินดียินร้าย

..... ไม่ใคร่อยากคบด้วย

..... ไม่ยินดีที่จะคบค้าด้วยเลย

..... แล้วแต่คน

๓๒. ก. (ถ้าตอบว่า "ยินดีคบค้าด้วยอย่างยิ่ง" หรือ "ไม่รังเกียจที่จะคบค้าด้วย" ถามต่อไป)

ถ้าท่านคบค้าสมาคมกับคนไทยฉันท์เพื่อน ท่านจะให้ความสนิทสนมกับเขามากน้อยแค่ไหน

..... ให้ความสนิทสนมอย่างยิ่ง (ให้ความสนิทสนมฉันท์ญาติ)

..... ให้ความสนิทสนมพอประมาณ

..... ให้ความสนิทสนมอย่างกลางๆ

..... ไม่ให้ความสนิทสนมมากนัก

..... ไม่ให้ความสนิทสนมเลย

..... แล้วแต่คน

๓๓. ในครัวเรือนของท่านมีสมาชิกที่เป็นคนไทยร่วมอยู่ด้วยบ้างหรือไม่

..... มี

..... ไม่มี

๓๓. ก. (ถ้า "มี" ถามต่อไป) เป็นใคร มีความสัมพันธ์กับท่านอย่างไร

.....

.....

๓๔. ตัวท่าน หรือญาติพี่น้อง หรือบุตรหลานที่ใกล้ชิดกับครอบครัวของท่าน มีใครแต่งงานกับคนไทยหรือไม่

..... มี

..... ไม่มี

๓๔. ก. (ถ้า "มี" ถามต่อไป) โปรดบอกว่าใคร มีความสัมพันธ์กับท่านอย่างไร

.....

และเขาทำพิธีสมรสแบบไหน

..... แบบจีน

..... แบบจีนปนไทย

..... แบบไทย

..... อื่นๆ (โปรดบอก)

๓๕. ถ้าสมมติว่าท่านกำลังหาคู่ครองอยู่ในขณะนี้ ท่านจะเลือกคู่ครองของท่านด้วยกฎเกณฑ์อะไรบ้าง

..... ต้องมีความรัก

..... รูปสวย

..... ฐานะดี

..... การศึกษาดี

..... ผู้ใหญ่เห็นชอบด้วย

..... เป็นคนจีน

..... เป็นคนไทย

..... เป็นคนจีนหรือไทยก็ได้

๓๕. ก. ถ้าท่านมีโอกาสเลือกระหว่างสองคนที่มีคุณสมบัติต้องตามกฎเกณฑ์

ที่ท่านกำหนดไว้ทุกประการ แต่คนหนึ่งเป็นคนไทย และอีกคนหนึ่ง เป็นคนจีน ท่านคิดว่าท่านจะเลือกใคร

..... คนจีน

..... คนไทย

..... คนจีนก็ได้ คนไทยก็ได้

๓๕. ข. โปรดอธิบายให้เหตุผล

.....

.....

.....

๓๖. ถ้าท่านมีพี่น้องญาติสนิทของท่านคนหนึ่งแต่งงานหรือจะแต่งงานกับคนไทย ท่านจะมีความรู้สึกอย่างไรต่อเขา

..... ยินดีและเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

..... ยินดีและเห็นด้วย

..... รู้สึกเฉยๆ

..... ไม่ใคร่เห็นด้วย

..... ไม่เห็นด้วยเลย

๓๖. ก. โปรดอธิบาย

.....

.....

.....

ข้อสุดท้าย (๓๗)

ก่อนจะจบการสัมภาษณ์ ผม - ดิฉัน อยากจะขอความกรุณาท่านได้โปรดแสดงความคิดเห็นโดยทั่วไปของท่านเกี่ยวกับคนจีนในเมืองไทย คนจีนจะผสมกลมกลืนเข้ากับคนไทยไหม หรือท่านคิดว่าคนจีนกับคนไทยจะคงเป็นคนละอย่าง คนละพวกกันอยู่ตลอดไปหรืออย่างไรแน่ ข้อนี้ไม่มีใครที่จะทายหรือพยากรณ์ได้ แต่ผม - ดิฉัน อยากฟังความคิดเห็นของท่าน ซึ่งไม่จำเป็นต้องเป็นเรื่องถูกเรื่องผิด

<u>บันทึกของผู้สัมภาษณ์</u>

ชื่อผู้สัมภาษณ์ .....

สัมภาษณ์เมื่อ .....

สถานที่สัมภาษณ์.....

เวลาที่ใช้ในการสัมภาษณ์.....

ผู้สัมภาษณ์ติดต่อผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์โดย .....

.....

ชื่อผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์ (ถ้าทราบ).....

English Translation of Interview Schedule

A study on the relations of Chinese and Thai people in Bangkok and Thonburi conducted by Thammasat University

Information about the interviewee

A. Sex:

..... Male

..... Female

B. Age:

..... 15 to 24 years

..... 25 to 34 years

..... 35 to 44 years

..... 45 to 54 years

..... 55 years and over

C. Birthplace:

..... Bangkok/Thonburi

..... Elsewhere in Thailand

..... China

..... Other place (specify)

D. (If the interviewee was born outside of Bangkok/Thonburi and immigrated into Bangkok/Thonburi):

Length of time the interviewee has resided in Bangkok/Thonburi ..n..... years

(If the interviewee was born in China or elsewhere outside of Thailand and immigrated into Thailand):

Length of time the interviewee has resided in Bangkok/Thonburi ..... years

E. Educational attainment:

Chinese education in Thailand	Thai education	Education in China	Education elsewhere (specify)	
.....	.....	.....	.....	7 years or lower
.....	.....	.....	.....	8 to 10 years
.....	.....	.....	.....	11 to 12 years
.....	.....	.....	.....	Over 12 years
.....	.....	.....	.....	No formal schooling

F. Native language of parents:

Father	Mother	
.....	.....	Teochiu
.....	.....	Hakka
.....	.....	Hainanese
.....	.....	Cantonese
.....	.....	Hokkian
.....	.....	Thai
.....	.....	Other (specify)

G. Speech group:

..... Teochiu	..... Hokkian
..... Hakka	..... Thai
..... Hainanese	..... Other (specify)
..... Cantonese	

H. Religious affiliation:

..... Buddhist/Confucianist

..... Christian

I. Occupational level (Interviewer is to ask for details and write them down in appropriate space according to instructions provided in the interview guide):*

..... 1

..... 2

..... 3

..... 4

..... 5

..... 6

J. Interview zone:

..... 1

..... 2

..... 3

K. Interview group:

..... Teochiu

..... Hakka

..... Hainanese

..... Cantonese

..... Hokkian

---

* Note: After each interview was completed the interviewer together with the project director make the final decision on the interviewee's occupational level.

1. What language(s)/dialect(s) do you speak?

..... Teochiu

..... Hakka

..... Hainanese

..... Cantonese

..... Hokkian

..... Thai

..... Other (specify)

2. What is your native tongue(s) or the first language(s)/ dialect(s) you spoke?

..... Teochiu

..... Hakka

..... Hainanese

..... Cantonese

..... Hokkian

..... Thai

..... Other (specify)

3. What language(s)/dialect(s) does your husband (or wife), your brothers/sisters or other close relatives who live with you in the same house speak?

..... Teochiu

..... Hakka

..... Hainanese

..... Cantonese

..... Hokkian

..... Thai

..... Other (specify)

4. In your daily life at home, which language, Chinese or Thai, do you speak more?

..... Chinese mostly or wholly

..... Chinese more

..... Chinese and Thai equally

..... Thai more

..... Thai mostly or wholly

5. In your daily life outside of your house, which language, Chinese or Thai, do you speak more?

..... Chinese mostly or wholly

..... Chinese more

..... Chinese and Thai equally

..... Thai more

..... Thai mostly or wholly

6. In your daily life, how necessary is it for you to speak Chinese?

..... Completely necessary

..... Very necessary

..... Equally necessary as Thai

..... Not very necessary

..... Not necessary at all

7. In your daily life, how necessary is it for you to speak Thai?

..... Completely necessary

..... Very necessary

..... Equally necessary

..... Not very necessary

..... Not necessary at all

8. How necessary do you think it is for your children or grandchildren or close relatives who have already grown up or will grow up to be adults in the future to know how to speak Chinese?

..... Completely necessary

..... Very necessary

..... Equally necessary to know as Thai

..... Not very necessary

..... Not necessary at all

9. How do you actually feel when your children or close relatives speak to you in Thai?

.....

.....

10. Do you have any children or brothers/sisters who are attending or have attended Thai schools?

..... Yes

..... No

10. A. (If "yes") How much schooling do you wish them to attain or have attained?

..... M. 3 or P. 7

..... M. 6 or M.S. 3

..... M. 8 or M.S. 5 or vocational school

..... University or its equivalent

11. What do you think about the statement, "Education makes people successful? It is the avenue for people to change their status"? Please explain and give examples.

.....

.....

.....

.....

12. If you had brothers/sisters or children or close relatives who wanted to go to school in order that they would one day be able to become government officials, how would you agree with them about this idea?

..... Completely agree and willing to support

..... Agree and willing to support

..... Indifferent, no opinion

..... Disagree and unwilling to support

..... Completely disagree and unwilling to support

12. A. Please explain why you have such opinion.

.....

.....

13. Do you practice the cult of ancestor/spirit worship?

..... Yes, every day

..... Yes, twice a month

..... Yes, on every ceremonious occasion (twice a year)

..... No, not at all

14. Do you make merit by presenting alms to (Buddhist) priests?

..... Yes, most often

..... Yes, often

..... Seldom

..... No, not at all

15. Do you ever give charities to Thai Buddhist monasteries (*wats*) such as in *tôd kathin*, *tôd phâpà* festivals or in helping to build, repair and maintain the *wat*?

..... Yes, most frequently

..... Yes, frequently

..... Seldom

..... No, not at all

(If the interviewee is Christian, either Protestant or Catholic, skip Question 16.)

16. It is generally believed that entering the priesthood is a way to pay moral debts to one's parents, what do you think about it?

..... Completely agree

..... Agree

..... Indifferent

..... Disagree

..... Completely disagree

(If the interviewee is female or Christian, skip Questions 17 and 18.)

17. Have you (or any of your close relatives in the same family) been in the Buddhist priesthood?

..... Yes

..... No

18. If you have a chance to be ordained will you like to do it?

..... Yes

..... No

18. A. Please explain why.

.....

.....

.....

19. If your sons, brothers or other close male relatives in your family have a chance to be ordained, will you like to see them do it?

..... Yes

..... No

20. There are various ways of merit-making and worshipping; some worship spirits in the shrine, others worship priests in the *wat* and yet others worship both priests in the *wat* and spirits in the shrine, *which* way do you do and think is good and correct?

.....

.....

.....

21. What is your opinion about the ceremonial connected with death, some believe that burial and entombment is correct according to the tradition--it gives much merit to the deceased, but others say cremation is more economical and convenient? Please explain your view.

.....

.....

.....

22. When someone in your family happens to pass away, which way does your family usually follow?

..... Purely Chinese

..... Partly Chinese and partly Thai

..... Purely Thai

..... Other (explain)

23. Were you to choose an occupation(s) according to your own liking, what occupation(s) would you choose?

..... A. Technical occupation, engineering, architecture

..... B. Medical doctor

..... C. Teaching

..n..... D. Trade and commerce

..... E. Military

..... F. Police

..... G. Gov't civil service

..... H. Business firm, enterprise

..... I. Other (specify)

23. A. Please explain why you would prefer such occupation(s)t

.....

.....

.....

24. If you have children or brothers/sisters and close relatives in your family, what occupation(s) would you like to see them follow?

.....

.....

.....

25. Do you agree or disagree with the statement, "Trade and commerce in Thailand will always remain a Chinese occupation"?

..... Completely agree

..... Agree

..... Indifferent

..... Disagree

..... Completely disagree

25. A. Please explain why you think so.

.....

.....

.....

26. Do you agree or disagree with the statement, "Government jobs are monopolized by Thais and Chinese people have no chance whatever to get them"?

..... Completely agree

..... Agree

..... Indifferent

..... Disagree

..... Completely disagree

26n A. Please explain "Why n"

.....

.....

.....

27. Do you agree or disagree with the statement, "Chinese people should be engaged in trade and commerce because it is the occupation for which they master greater skills"?

..... Completely agree

..... Agree

..... Indifferent

..... Disagree

..... Completely disagree

27n A. Please explain "Why n"

.....

.....

.....

28. Do you agree or disagree with the statement that the Thai people should be government officials and should not involve themselves in the trade and commerce?

..... Completely agree

..... Agree

..... Indifferent

..... Disagree

..... Completely disagree

28. A. Please explain "Why.n'

.....

.....

.....

29. In your everyday life, do you see more Chinese or more Thai people?

..... Lots more Chinese

..... More Chinese

..... About the same

..... More Thais

..... Lots more Thais

30. Among your friends whom you usually do things or go places with, are there more Chinese or more Thai people?

..... Lots more Chinese

..... More Chinese

..... About the same

..... More Thais

..... Lots more Thais

31. Among your close friends with whom you usually talknabout personal affairs and from whom you usually receive help when necessary, are there more Chinese or more Thai people?

..... Lots more Chinese

..... More Chinese

..... About the same

..... More Thais

..... Lots more Thais

31. A. Please explain why it is so.

.....

.....

32. If you have the opportunity to associate with Thais and have them as friends doing things and going places together, would you be willing or unwilling to associate with them?

..... Very willing

..... Willing

..... Indifferent

..... Unwilling

..... Very unwilling

..... Depends on who they are individually

32. A. (If the answer is "very willing" or "willing")e

If you associate with them, how intimately would you allow yourself to associate with them?

..... Very intimately (as intimately as with close relatives)

..... Somewhat intimately

..... Not intimately

..... Not intimately at all

..... Depends on who they are individually

33. Are there any Thai members in your household?

..... Yes

..... No

33. A. (If "yes")

Who are they? How are they related to you?

.....

.....

34e Are there any of your brothers/sisters, children or other close relatives who are married to Thais?

..... Yes

..... No

34. A. (If "yes") Please tell me how they are related to you.

.....

.....

34. B. And what kind of wedding did they have?

..... Purely Chinese

..... Mixed Chinese and Thai

..... Purely Thai

..... Other (please explain)

35. Supposing that you were to choose a marriage partner, whatn criteria would you use to guide your decision?

..... Love

..... Appearance

..... Wealth

..... Education

..... Approval of elders (parents)

..... Must be Chinese

..... Must be Thai

..... Either Chinese or Thai wouldn't make a difference

35. A. If you were to choose to marry one of two persons who both meet all your requirements, but one happens to be Thai and the other Chinese, which one do you think you would choose?

..... Chinese

..... Thai

..... Either Thai or Chinese would make no difference

35. B. Please explain why.

.....

.....

36. If one of your sisters/brothers or other close relatives were married to a Thai, how would you feel about it?

..... Completely approve

..... Somewhat approve

..... Indifferent

..... Somewhat disapprove

..... Completely disapprove

36. A. Please explain why.

.....

.....

.....

37n Final Question

Before terminating our interview, I would like to ask you to please express your general opinion about the Chinese people in Thailand. Would the Chinese be assimilated with the Thai, or would the Chinese and the Thainalways remain different and belong to different groups, or what? This question is something no one could easily predict or guess, but I would like to hear your comments which are not necessarily true or falsen

.....

.....

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Interviewer's note:

Name of interviewer .....

Date of interview .....

Place of interview .....

Length of interview .....

How interviewee was approached .....

Name of interviewee (if known) .....

Assignment Sheet

Name of interviewer.....
Date of assignment.....
Date of completion.....
Zone.....
Dialect.....
Group.....

	M= ( )				
	A g e				
	1	2	3	4	5
N:					

	F= ( )				
	A g e				
	1	2	3	4	5

	E D U C A T I O N				
N:					

	E D U C A T I O N				

	O C C U P A T I O N					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
N:						

O C C U P A T I O N					
1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX II

Field Notes and Data Gathering Techniques

Besides the nine hundred (900) main interviews which serve as the basis of the present report, one hundred (100) pre-test interviews were conducted earlier for the following purposest

1. To test the interview schedule in terms of its relevance, applicability and wording of questions designed for use among the Chinese people in urban Bangkok and Thonburi.

2. To test the effectiveness of the criteria of dividing subjects into three discrete groups based on their social characteristics and interaction with Thait

3. To derive insights into problems of sampling.

4. To give the interviewer on-the-job training, extended from classroom lectures.

The results of the pre-test interviews can be found in the *Preliminary Report* prepared by the principal investigator, February 1967, Thammasat University. All interviews (pre-tests included) were conducted in either the Thai or the Chinese language (in any of the five dialects spoken in Bangkok and Thonburi) depending on the informant's choice.

The study was formally launched in October, 1966. The first several weeks were devoted to sampling design, construction of the interview schedule, recruitment of interviewers, training of interviewers, pre-testing and reorganizing approaches. Originally all of these activities together with interviewing in the main survey were expected to last seventeen weeks. However, as the field work progressed there arose a number of unanticipated problems some of which have been reported in Chapter I, which barred the completion of data collection on schedulet As it developed, field work and data processing required nine months. In August, 1967 I left Thailand to resume my graduate study in the United States and began analyzing the data in Ithaca, New York. However, the first draft of this report was not completed until over a year later when I was a Cornell doctoral student *in absentia* study at Harvard University in 1968-1969.

Although the responsibility for the conduct of the research and the presentation of this report rests with me as project

leader, a task of this magnitude could not possibly have been accomplished by one man's effort. At times there were as many as eighteen active interviewers in the project searching for suitable respondents in the districts of Bangkok and Thonburi, though at some other times the number of interviewers diminished to merely five or six. The fluctuation of the size of the interview staff was due to other commitments of individual interviewers who were full-time students, businessmen, government officials or university lecturers. All of the interviewers were native speakers of Thai as well as one of the Chinese dialects spoken in Thailand. They were either university graduates or upper-class undergraduate students. Their academic disciplines varied from business and economics to law, linguistics, and psychology. About one-third of them, notably the psychology undergraduates at Thammasat University, had had previous interviewing experience. After the interviewers were recruited, they were provided with classroom training which involved lectures on topics such as interview techniques, techniques of establishing rapport, methods of selecting interviewees and the rationale or presupposition of this research. They were also assigned to do "practice interviews" in Chinese among themselves. Later, when the pre-test interviews were being conducted, the majority of the interviewers had the opportunity to undergo further on-the-job practical training.

The interview schedule was written in Thai and the recording of interview responses, though given in Thai as well as Chinese, was also done in Thai. As can be seen from the interview schedule and its English translation attached to Appendix I, the interview questions included both the pre-coded and open-ended types. Altogether there are thirty-seven main questions and fifteen sub-questions. In addition to the questions dealing specifically with the substantive problems of the research, there are ten questions concerning the informant's social characteristics. These questions were included to assist the interviewer in selecting his interviewees as well as to aid the investigator in checking the accuracy of the interviewer's performance.

On the average, an interview took about forty-five minutes to one hour to complete. However, there were cases reported which lasted up to two hours. These were mostly cases of petty store owners or shop keepers who had to interrupt their interviews repeatedly to attend to their on-going activities.

Questions were structured in order of priorities ranging from those concerned with simple to more complex contents, i.e., from questions on the daily use of language to those on family and intermarriage. While some interview questions were written with the primary aim of eliciting information about the respondent's overt behavior in particular aspects of his social rela-

tions with the Thai people, others were designed to extract information about the respondent's attitudes toward assimilation. For example, when we asked whether the respondent had or had not been in the Buddhist priesthood we also asked him *why* he had or had not done so and *what* he thought about being ordained. Similarly, after asking the respondent whether any of his close relatives had married a Thai we probed by questioning him whether he approved or disapproved such intermarriage and *why*.

The interviews were conducted in a great variety of physical and social circumstances ranging from first-class airconditioned offices to sweaty and noisy workshops; from places filled with millions of baht cash (such as money storerooms in the Bank of Thailand and commercial banks) to poverty-stricken slums. Our respondents, likewise, included people at all levels of social stratification and walks of life. They ranked from the Governor of the Bank of Thailand, managers and executives of both government and private organizations to white-collar office workers and hard laborerst

In approaching the respondents in Group I and Group II, the interviewer employed such techniques as visiting people in their homes or places of work and asking directly for their cooperation; and asking for introductions from friends, colt leagues and relatives. Sometimes an interviewer had to spend a very long time traveling from place to place or contacting one person after another in order to fulfill his specific assignmentt Unless the interviewer was able to work out a list of prospective interviewees (who would be applicable to his sampling assignment) on the basis of previous contacts, he had to attempt to locate and select his respondents by calling upon anonymous persons in the streets, at their stores, offices or residences. Although most interviewers reported that more often than not the people approached were willing to grant interviews, most frequently they did not fit with the required sample. Hence, after initial questioning, the interview had to be terminated. But in easier cases, such as when assigned interviews were to be done with people between 15 and 24 years old who were univert sity students, who were also in the Teochiu dialect category and resident in Zone I, an interviewer was able to complete a relatively larger number of interviews in a short period of time.

I made it a rule to assign to each interviewer a limited number of interviews to be handled at each time. Usually, five interviews were assigned with definite instructions (an example of the assignment sheet is shown in Appendix I). However, in easier cases, up to fifteen interviews were sometimes assigned to an interviewer during a period of his work in the field. By giving a small assignment to an interviewer at each time, I was able to maintain constant and adequate control over the sampling

procedure and the performance of each interviewer. In addition to this means of control, each completed interview schedule was checked for its completion, correctness in the sampling selection, address and name (where available) of the respondent. Whenever feasible, a few respondents, selected at random, were asked whether they had been interviewed. Occasionally, interviewers were assigned to investigate their colleagues' performance by contacting the respondents whose names had been recorded on completed interview schedules.

Despite the anticipated and unanticipated difficulties and slowness of field interviews with respondents in Groups I and II, the most difficult and hard-to-obtain interviews were those that had to be done with Group III, which was the Thai Government employee group. The majority in this group would not consent to be interviewed unless written permission was granted to the investigator by their superiors. The interviewer, therefore, could visit them only when he had a proper letter of introduction and guidance. It was difficult and time consuming for me to secure needed letters of introduction for my interviewers and in several instances I was flatly denied cooperation by the civil service personnel I called upon. Once an official letter of introduction (or permission) was received, however, it was very convenient for the interviewer. The following Thai governmental organizations granted permission to their employees to be interviewed:

1. The Bank of Thailand
2. Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation
3. Department of Commercial Intelligence
4. Department of Internal Trade
5. Department of Commercial Registration (Division of Insurance)
6. The Port Authority of Bangkok
7. Thailand's Tobacco Monopoly

In addition to these agencies, I was also able to conduct my study among personnel of the Bangkok Commercial College and Thammasat University who fitted the definition of "Chinese people" laid down and were themselves also Thai government employees.

REFERENCE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amyot, Jacques. "Adapting to the Milieu," Serial The Overseas Chinese Part II, *The Asia Magazine* (April 9, 1967), 3 ff.

Brim, Orville G., Jr. and Stanton Wheeler. *Socialization After Childhood*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Coughlin, Richard J. "The Chinese in Bangkok: A Commercial-Oriented Minority," *American Sociological Review*, XX, 3 (June, 1955), 311-316.

————. *Double Identity: The Chinese in Modern Thailand*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960.

Dibble, Charles. *The Chinese in Thailand Against the Background of Chinese-Thai Relations*. Ph.D. thesis, Syracuse University. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilm, Inc., 1960.

Eisenstadt, Shmauel N. *The Absorption of Immigrants*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.

Freedman, Maurice. "The Chinese in Southeast Asia," in Andrew W. Lind (ed.), *Race Relations in World Perspective*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1955.

Landon, Kenneth P. *The Chinese in Thailand*. New York: Institute of Public Relations, 1941.

Mandelbaum, D. G. (ed.). *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Culture, Language, and Personality*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1965.

Munch, Peter. "Social Adjustments Among Wisconsin Norwegians," *American Sociological Review* (December, 1949), 780-787.

National Statistical Office. *Census Report of Thailand B.E. 2503*. Changwad Series. Bangkok and Thonburi, 1960.

Park, Robert E. "Assimilation, Social," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. II. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1930.

Purcell, Victor. "'Scientific Analysis' or 'Procrustean Bed'?" Review Article of G. William Skinner, *Chinese Society in Thailand* in *The Journal of Asian Studies*, XVII, 2 (February, 1958), 223-232.

———————. *The Chinese in Southeast Asia.* 2nd edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Rosenthal, Erich. "Acculturation Without Assimilation? The Jewish Community of Chicago, Illinois," *American Journal of Sociology* (November, 1960), 275-288.

Shibutani, T. "Reference Groups as Perspectives," *American Journal of Sociology* (May, 1955), 562-569.

Simpson, George E. and J. Milton Yinger. *Racial and Cultural Minorities: An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination.* 3rd edition. New York and London: Harper & Row, 1965.

Simpson, George E. "Assimilation," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. I. The MacMillan Co. and The Free Press, 1968. 438-444.

Skinner, G. William. *Chinese Society in Thailand: An Analytical History.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1957.

———————. *Leadership and Power in the Chinese Community of Thailand.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1958.

———————. "Chinese Assimilation and Thai Politics," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, XVI, 2 (February, 1957), 237-250.

———————. "Change and Persistence in Chinese Culture Overseas: Comparison of Thailand and Java," *Journal of South Seas Society*, 16 (1960), 86-100.

———————. "The Thailand Chinese: Assimilation in a Changing Society," *Asia*, 2 (Autumn, 1964), 80-92.

Thompson, Virginia. *Thailand: The New Siam.* New York: The MacMillan Co., 1941.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. *Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

In Thai

Khajadphai Burutphat. "Chao Čhin Nai Prathet Thai Kap Panha Dan Kanmuang" (The Chinese in Thailand and Political Problems), *The Journal of Social Sciences*, VII, 1 (January, 1970), 95-126.

National Research Councile *KanWichai Ruang Panha Khon Čhin Nai Prathet Thai* (Research Concerning the Chinese Problem in Thailand)e Mimeoe, 1962e

Phichai Ratanaphon. *Wiwatthanakan Kankhuapkhum Rongrian Čhin* (Changes in Control of Chinese Schools)e Unpublished M.P.A. thesis, National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok, 1969e

Sawaeng Ratanamongkolmase *Kanborihan ngan Khong Samakhom Čhin: Botsuksa Chapho Korani Samakhom Taečhiu Haeng Prathet Thai* (The Administration of a Chinese Associeiation: A Case Study of the Teochiu Association of Thailand)e Unpublished M.P.A. thesis, National Institute of Development Adminise tration, Bangkok, 1967e

Yupharet Milligane *Botbat Khong Chao Čhin Nai Prathet Thai* (The Role of the Chinese in Thailand)e Unpublished M.A. thesis, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, 1967.